

Herodotus: The Greek Struggle for Freedom

by

Margaret Eda Penner

B.A. (Humanities), Simon Fraser University, 2008
M.A. (English Literature), University of Toronto, 1986
M.A. (History), McMaster University, 1982
B.A. (History), Simon Fraser University, 1975

Thesis in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in the
Department of Humanities
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

© Margaret Eda Penner 2014

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Fall 2014

All rights reserved.

However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for "Fair Dealing." Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

Approval

Name: Margaret Eda Penner
Degree: Master of Arts (Humanities)
Title: *Herodotus: The Greek Struggle for Freedom*

Examining Committee:

Chair: Anne-Marie Feenberg-Dibon
Professor and Graduate Chair

David Mirhady
Senior Supervisor
Professor
Department of Humanities

Paul Dutton
Supervisor
Professor
Department of Humanities

Dimitris Krallis
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Hellenic Studies & History

Date Defended/Approved: December 12, 2014

Partial Copyright Licence



The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the non-exclusive, royalty-free right to include a digital copy of this thesis, project or extended essay[s] and associated supplemental files (“Work”) (title[s] below) in Summit, the Institutional Research Repository at SFU. SFU may also make copies of the Work for purposes of a scholarly or research nature; for users of the SFU Library; or in response to a request from another library, or educational institution, on SFU’s own behalf or for one of its users. Distribution may be in any form.

The author has further agreed that SFU may keep more than one copy of the Work for purposes of back-up and security; and that SFU may, without changing the content, translate, if technically possible, the Work to any medium or format for the purpose of preserving the Work and facilitating the exercise of SFU’s rights under this licence.

It is understood that copying, publication, or public performance of the Work for commercial purposes shall not be allowed without the author’s written permission.

While granting the above uses to SFU, the author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in the Work, and may deal with the copyright in the Work in any way consistent with the terms of this licence, including the right to change the Work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the Work in whole or in part, and licensing the content to other parties as the author may desire.

The author represents and warrants that he/she has the right to grant the rights contained in this licence and that the Work does not, to the best of the author’s knowledge, infringe upon anyone’s copyright. The author has obtained written copyright permission, where required, for the use of any third-party copyrighted material contained in the Work. The author represents and warrants that the Work is his/her own original work and that he/she has not previously assigned or relinquished the rights conferred in this licence.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

revised Fall 2013

Ethics Statement



The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research:

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator or research assistant in a research project approved in advance,

or

- d. as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

update Spring 2010

Abstract

The narrative that Herodotus offers in the *Histories* relates how and why Persia and Greece clashed in mighty conflicts over power. Throughout his narrative, Herodotus includes descriptions of clashes over freedom in societies in the ancient known world. Herodotus approaches the conflicts between political systems in autonomy and autocracy with a measured and objective tone. He illustrates how geography, climate, and culture affect the various political systems. The present analysis is based on M.H. Hansen's nine principles of freedom in the classical Greek world and shows how Herodotus weaves the motif of freedom into his narrative in writing the *Histories*. Herodotus states that he makes a "display" of his "history" (research) to show the deeds of both Greeks and non-Greeks and to explain how they gain, maintain, and lose freedom, and why they wage war. The reason they clash turns out largely to do with their different approaches to freedom.

Keywords: Herodotus; freedom; autonomy; autocracy; political systems; stability

Dedication

To my husband, Walt

Carpe Diem!

Acknowledgements

Thank you to so many fantastic people who have helped, encouraged, and have shared with me in the excitement of working on Herodotus' *Histories*. Above all I would like to thank my senior supervisor Professor David Mirhady who has been tireless and steady in helping me to complete this project. From nearly the beginning he has patiently helped me learn Greek so I could translate numerous parts of Herodotus. With quiet perseverance he has guided me to look beyond the words. What he has done for me, and I shall never be able to thank him enough, is that he has opened up the ancient Greek and Persian worlds –the most exciting venture I have ever had the opportunity to embrace in my studies. I also want to give my heartfelt thank you to Professor Emily O'Brien, who has opened up to me the world of the Latin language and has aided me in understanding how the ancient world continuously impinges upon succeeding periods of history and in particular, the Renaissance period. With enormous gratitude I appreciate Professor Paul Dutton's willingness to be an examiner and at this time I want to thank him for his wonderful Medieval classes. With great pleasure I would like to thank Professor Dimitris Krallis for being willing to be the external examiner and I would like to thank him for his inspiring Byzantine classes which I was fortunate enough to take a few years ago.

There are many other professors who have helped me, but Professor Chris Morrissey is the one who started me on the road to the classics when he introduced me to Latin and Greek. I would like to thank Professor Anne-Marie Feenberg-Dibon for her encouragement and guidance in meeting the thesis' deadline. The smiles and encouragement from Alice, Carolyn, and Katie in the Department of Humanities have been so very uplifting over the years. Thank you for your many "miles" of hours which you have put in for me. I thank the Simon Fraser University Department of Humanities for having exactly the programme I needed – a programme that "crosses the borders" in the studies of mankind. For years I have searched for a discipline like the one that Simon Fraser offers.

There are many friends to thank, but especially I would like to thank Huyen Pham for her friendship and her computer help. What a pleasure it has been to meet Cameron

Duncan and his encouraging smile in the hallways and to have his presence at presentations. The encouragement from our friends, Marney and Vic Harrison, and from our children and their spouses means more to me than I can adequately express. Finally, without my husband's understanding, love, and helpful steadiness, I would not have been able to "Carpe Diem" in the wonderful ancient world of Greece and Asia Minor.

Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Partial Copyright Licence	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
Chapter 1. Herodotus and Hansen’s Nine Principles of Freedom	1
Chapter 2. The Freedom Motif.....	30
2.1. Freedom as <i>Leitmotiv</i>	35
Chapter 3. Herodotus: The Political Freedom Circuit.....	50
Bibliography	71
Appendix I. Primary & Secondary Passages on Freedom.....	74
PRIMARY CITATIONS:.....	74
SECONDARY PRINCIPLES:	75
Appendix II. Political Systems based on Societies & City-states from Chap. 3	77
Autonomous Political Systems with one change or no change in the Autonomous Condition:	77
Societies with One or More Changes in their Political Systems:.....	77

Chapter 1.

Herodotus and Hansen's Nine Principles of Freedom

The analysis of Hansen's principles segregates each principle into two categories: primary and secondary.¹ The primary meaning in the freedom passages represents the principle under discussion. The secondary category touches on the primary meaning but does not express it with the same transparency. From my translations of freedom passages in *The Histories* I have determined that there are seventy-one primary passages and eighty-seven secondary passages in which the concept of freedom comes into play.²

According to Hansen the nine principles on freedom centre on two particular meanings: one is freedom (*eleutheria*) and democracy (principles 1-7); the other encompasses Plato and Aristotle's philosophical meanings of freedom (8-9). Freedom as a word in the classical world and in Herodotus' text has many senses and uses. Hansen focuses on the noun ("freedom") and the adjective ("free").³ This study includes the verb ("to free") and the adverb ("freely"). In Herodotus the freedom passages fall under the headings of class, politics, society and culture. They convey different nuances, systems, and conditions to designate an in depth understanding of freedom and slavery in the different societies of the classical world (500 – 323 B.C.E.).

Hansen's first principle (#1) in the meaning of freedom is that the individual is free and not a slave (*doulos*). The first thing a Greek in antiquity says to explain the

¹ Hansen 2010 1-9.

² Herodotus clearly prefers the freedom of Athens under the popular political system. In conjunction with this view, Herodotus demonstrates that in order to have freedom a city or a nation must fight to the end to maintain autonomy. Cf. ch. 3.

³ Hansen 2010 1.

difference between a free person and a slave is that the freeman is his own master; the slave is the possession of his master (*despotes*).⁴ Demosthenes, a fourth-century orator, states that the fundamental difference between a slave and a free person is that the slave may be whipped.⁵ Herodotus provides an example of this view when he illustrates how the Scythians defeat the offspring of their slaves. As soon as the Scythians replace their spears and bows with horsewhips, the progeny of the slaves drop their weapons and flee (Hdt. 4.3-4).

Herodotus employs his approach to the dissimilarities between the free person and the slave in three examples that reflect Hansen's #1 principle. The passages establish the definition of a slave. The first passage characterizes royalty as free within the Persian context. At the same time the three #1 primary passages serve as the basis for further discussion of the attributes required of a free person or of a nation on how to become free, and how to maintain freedom.

The first passage illustrates the system among the Persians that one is either born a slave or a noble. Astyages, king of the Medes, observes as he looks at Cyrus that the features of the child do not resemble a slave, rather that they are similar to his own (Hdt. 1.116.1). Herodotus reinforces the royal resemblance with a description of Cyrus and his playmates' game. Among his fellow playmates, they choose him to be king. He sets them to tasks, but one boy disobeys Cyrus so he orders him to be whipped (Hdt. 1.114.4-5). The account indicates that Cyrus, the child, is royal, a master, even though slaves have brought him up. This is strengthened when Astyages recognizes that Cyrus' "manner of answering was rather free" for a slave. As a free person, however, Cyrus freely accepts and is accountable for his actions, for he says to the king that if he acted wrongly he will take the deserved punishment (Hdt. 1.116-

⁴ Hansen 2010 2.

⁵ Hansen 2010 2. Greeks of Athens are willing and free to use physical force on their slaves (cf. Mirhady 2000 58-9). The freedom to use force is based on the assumption that slaves are animate property and possessions. This prefigures Aristotle, *Politics* 1.4.1-3. Cf. Wiedemann 1989 17-8.

115.5).⁶ Thus, at the beginning of his *Histories* Herodotus makes clear the difference between a slave and royal (a free person) through the report of Cyrus' countenance, actions, speech, and the impression these matters make upon Astyages.

The typology in this account reinforces the concept that one is born royal and free, destined to fulfill a task or some type of responsibility. For the Persians, Cyrus' undertaking is to free them from Mede slavery. The nuances in the narrative suggest a common characteristic with folktales from other cultures. In this variation, a royal babe is exposed, destined to die, but is rescued and later is recognized as the true heir (Hdt. 1.109-119).⁷

The second part of Hansen's #1 principle focuses on the master and slave relationship. The example Herodotus uses involves the Thracian slave, Rhodopis, who is freed in Egypt and subsequently earns for herself an enormous amount of wealth – some claim enough to build pyramids – as well as a famous reputation. Herodotus establishes his own credibility in reliable reporting as he explains why he dismisses the amount of wealth that she has that would be enough to build pyramids. He cites evidence that she cannot have lived in the time period in which common knowledge places her so other common facts may be questionable as well (Hdt. 1.134). Once Herodotus demonstrates the reliability of his credentials he moves forward in his account on how Rhodopis, the slave from Thrace, is brought to Egypt and set free by Charaxus. Once free she plies her trade, becomes wealthy, and bestows “a great number of iron-ox spits” in the temple at Delphi. Further, she has lasting fame in a song called Archidice (Hdt. 1.135.4-6). Herodotus retains respectability in reporting when he says that it is his duty to tell what is said, but he is not bound to believe it; this applies to his whole account (Hdt. 7.152.3).

⁶ As Mirhady 2004 60 writes in “The Athenian Rational for Torture,” Antiphon in his fifth speech states that a free person does not change his story even if torture awaits him; he “sticks to it,” for it is assumed that the freeman will tell the truth. A slave will change his story in order to end physical force regardless of future consequences (Ant. 5.61-7).

⁷ In Cyrus' case the slave woman who fed him has a Mede name, Spako, meaning dog (*spax* – Hdt. 1.110.1). This contributes to his royal status and hints at such folktales as Romulus and Remus because of the “dog” connotation. Other examples of folktales are the Old Testament Biblical Moses and *Gilgamesh*; the former's destiny is to free the Israelites in Egypt, the second one's destiny is to find his true self (Cf. Thompson 1951 276-7).

Herodotus employs three types of evidence to prove his point that Rhodopis is a slave who is set free, becomes wealthy, and acquires fame. When her master Xanthus brings her to Egypt as a possession, she is purchased as a piece of property and then set free by Charaxus of Mytilene, brother of the well-known poetess, Sappho. Herodotus uses the verb *luo* when he reports that she is set free. The passive of *luo* (*eluthe* – was loosed) reports the sale of the slave who is property. Generally, *luo* means to let loose, but according to Powell in his lexicon, one of the definitions in the passive voice means that the freedom of a slave is purchased – she is freed.⁸

Credibility continues with Herodotus' eyewitness report of the iron ox-spits in the temple at Delphi. Herodotus describes exactly where they are placed in the temple; they are set behind the Chian altar in front of the shrine.⁹ The final proof that Rhodopis is a possession set free, becomes wealthy, then donates gifts to the temple at Delphi, is the traditional theme in the song Archidice, known as Rhodopis, sung through Greece in later days (Hdt. 2.135.2).¹⁰ Herodotus seems to have in mind that Rhodopis, once freed, is able to do many great things, demonstrating that freedom is better than slavery.

⁸ Powell 212. The references to historical figures add support to the tale. The *OCD* cites Xanthus as a possible contemporary of Herodotus (I question this because of his connection to Rhodopis. Charaxus, brother of Sappho who bought and set Rhodopis free, would have lived in the second half of the seventh century). The *OCD* also says that Gyges and Croesus are mentioned in Xanthus' fragments (1627). Rhodopis is cited as a fellow slave of the legendary Aesop of Aesop's *Fables* (Hdt. 2.134.4).

⁹ How and Wells attest to the eyewitness report. According to their text, the French in 1893 found the iron ox-spits in the exact same spot that Herodotus indicates (233). A puzzle arises with the Rhodopis narrative. Was it unnatural for Rhodopis to be a slave since she could have been a Greek from Thrace? (There were many Greeks besides Thracian tribes in the region; Hdt. 5.25; 6.45; 7.115, 185). Aristotle says, "non-Greeks and slaves are by nature identical" (*Politics* 1.2.1252b34-9). With her freedom regained, she returns to her natural state and her increasing wealth is a mark of favour in her condition. Herodotus may have considered this possibility. However, Herodotus says nothing about the period before she was a slave, yet she is a fellow slave of Aesop, who, so the legends say, used his mind to write fables, which means he possessed reason which is what a free person has according to Aristotle (Hdt. 2.134.4; 1.2.(1254b2-26). So as a fellow slave of Aesop might she not have been captured and put in to slavery?

¹⁰ In these passages on Rhodopis, the verb *luo* is used twice. The first time it is employed as a passive and the second time as an aorist middle participle (having loosed). The passive word *eleutherothe* (was set free) is applied with the same meaning as *luo* to suggest that there is an interchangeability between these three words. These meanings work jointly with Powell's definitions; Herodotus chooses the voice and tense (Hdt. 135.1-2.6; Powell 114, 212).

In the third division of Hansen's #1 primary principle, the word "freedom" takes on the attributes and actions of what it means to be a free person or the characteristics of a slave (6.11). In Herodotus' smooth structural style he moves from narration to direct speech in order to emphasize the significance of what freedom entails for each individual. In the narrative the Persian generals in Ionia command the Ionian tyrants to direct their cities that despite the rebellion against the king they will be forgiven and suffer no harm if they side with the Persians. If they fight the king on the side of the mainland Greeks, every abuse will be laid upon them (6.9).

It is at this point, when the Ionians are at Lade in assembly that Dionysius the Phocaeen general speaks in response to the Persian message:

Our affairs, men of Ionia, stand on the edge of a razor, whether to be freemen or slaves, and runaway slaves at that. If you now consent to endure hardships, you will have toil for the present time, but it will be in your power to overcome your enemies and gain freedom; but if you will be weak and disorderly, I see nothing that can save you from paying the penalty to the king for your rebellion. (Hdt. 6.11)

His direct speech incorporates the word "freemen"; he uses the plural first person possessive pronoun, 'our affairs' to sound more persuasive and to be one of the Ionians so that they will agree to his plan and take his advice. Dionysius emphasizes the importance and danger for the Ionians when he employs the sharp-edged metaphor that they stand on the "razor-edge" (*xurou...akmes*) in this matter; their decision will make them freemen or slaves (6.11.2). The razor-edge or cliff that the Ionians stand on mirrors the sentence structure of the speech. The word 'slaves' is used twice and the words "freemen/freedom" are the counter balance. In the same way he arranges the rigours of being free – suffering and toil against the cowardliness and disorder in slavery (6.11.2). Herodotus finalizes the speech with one more balancing act as he uses the first person singular pronoun to say that he sees nothing but punishment ahead if there is rebellion, or he says, "I promise you" that if the gods are on our side, we will not meet the enemy in battle or we shall have victory. The gods are now brought in to show that he is a pious and trustworthy man (6.11.3); it is safe to follow his advice.

Herodotus ensures in this passage of direct speech that the important aspects of freedom versus slavery are stressed. At the same time he protects his credibility and

shades his words with a particle “perhaps” (*kou*) that has the underlying sense that the words are not exact, but the content is close to being accurate because he has neither a report from a source nor is he an eye witness (6.11.1). What he does have is the vehicle of direct speech to show that one cannot simply wait and allow freedom to happen. He puts the Ionians on the precipice of a decision; it takes hard work and direct action in order to be free. He structures the speech so that it offers one way or another to show that both ways cannot be taken.

Herodotus incorporates his own approach to freedom with two concepts in the speech; the right decision and hard work may bring freedom, or passivity and laziness will bring slavery. Hansen does not include these concepts in the #1 primary principle nor is there any mention of doubt concerning a decision on freedom or slavery. Despite the fact that this speech is addressed to a crowd, the passage belongs under #1 because each individual will be a free person or a slave depending on the verdict of the Ionians in the assembly and the manner in which the decision is carried out.

Hansen’s principle #1 focuses strictly on the definitions of what it is to be a slave or a free person, but Herodotus takes the definitions further when he elaborates with examples of what is involved in freedom or slavery. He has Dionysius’ speech to the Ionians foreshadow the necessary tools that must be used to be free or the consequences when these mechanisms are not exercised. Two stages in the secondary #1 principle illustrate Herodotus’ approach to the road towards freedom. The first stage falls under the heading of the “Decision”. There are five passages where a decision to be a free person or a slave occur. He follows the “decision making” passage touching on the #1 primary principle (6.11) with fifteen examples of the circumstances under which various freedom conditions are in effect. This is the intermediate period before the final stage. In the final stage, if the decision to gain or to maintain freedom is chosen, the only alternative is to take action and fight. The paradox that presents itself is that, although freedom is desired, it does not come without hard work; what it does do is to set up a city or a state to fight.

The first passage in the “Decision” stage sets the scene with the metaphor of the bridge between the Ionian Greek tyrants (except for Miltiades) and the Persians. The

passage is highly significant because two concepts are an integral part of the decision. The Athenian general Miltiades advises the Ionians to follow the Scythian's advice to break the bridge so the Persians cannot return to their homeland; Ionia would then be free of the Persian external tyranny (Hdt. 4.137.1). This not only brings to the forefront the freedom versus slavery issue, but it also draws in the larger geographical picture of the power struggle between the West and the East. The second important concept that is introduced is the political system of democracy – the rule of the people (*demokratie*) - whereby the citizens make the decisions and take turns ruling and being ruled (4.137.2-3).¹¹ Histiaeus of Miletus, who is loyal to Darius, presents the other side (he is an internal city tyrant put in place by Darius). Ironically, on Herodotus' part, Histiaeus is the one Herodotus chooses to bring in the word democracy to say that if the tyrants in each of the cities agree to break the bridge and free the people, they will lose their wealth and power. The outcome of these two opposing pieces of advice is that the Ionians decide to follow Histiaeus' counsel and remain slaves of Persia to retain their tyrannical positions.¹² If the Ionians follow Miltiades' advice from the Scythians they may have become free, but it is very hard work to gain one's freedom and to keep it.

The decision not to follow the wiser advice (in the eyes of Herodotus) is a pattern that appears frequently in the *Histories*. When Xerxes, son of Darius, is in counsel with Artabanus his uncle, Artabanus in direct speech adamantly advises Xerxes not to include the Ionians in the invasion of the Greek Mainland for fear of the disunity in the ranks they may cause. Despite Artabanus' advice Xerxes carries out his plan to march into Greece with the Ionians. Ultimately, the Greeks defeat the Persians (Hdt. 7.51); this

¹¹ This is the first time Herodotus uses the word 'democracy'.

¹² The bridge debate reflects Dionysius' speech in 6.11. Both decision-making proposals (6.11 and 4.137) are made under the reign of Darius (558-486 B.C.E.). Herodotus purposely shows his irony by introducing the word 'democracy' first in his *Histories* through the mouth of a tyrant. The tyrant sees one side, his side, which means his wealth and power would be lost.

is not to say that the choice to include the Ionians causes the Persian defeat; other factors are involved as well.¹³

On the other hand Herodotus also provides an example of when wise advice is followed (Hdt. 8.144). The Persians with Mardonius are in mainland Greece and the Lacedaemonian envoys are fearful that the Athenians will join forces with the Persians. In this case, there is a unity of spirit both with the Athenians' earlier decision as inferred and with the Lacedaemonians' request. The Athenians, in one voice, agree that they will never partner with the enemy: first, because freedom is the Athenian priority; secondly, the Persians have destroyed their temples; thirdly, all Greeks are kin (they have the same blood, language, and customs); and finally, with the greatest emphasis they state that "as long as one Athenian is . . . alive [there will be] no agreement with Xerxes" (8.144.3).

It is in the final Decision stage that Herodotus takes his audience to the enemy camp where a fateful decision is made. In council it is decided to fight the Greeks, following the choice of Mardonius rather than to attempt to bribe the Greek leaders with silver and gold. The expectation is that the Greek leaders would give up Greek freedom for their own material riches. Herodotus conveys three significant messages (Hdt. 9.41): Artabanus' forecast of a food advantage comes to pass since the Persians move inside the walls of Thebes where there is an abundance of food and fodder (7.49.5; 9.44.4). The bribery of silver and gold might save lives, but it draws attention to another issue. The Greeks live in a barren land – in what Persians call poverty. As a result the Persian Artabazus – who is highly regarded by Xerxes, which suggests that Xerxes might have approved of this option – calls for a bribe with the notion that the Greeks can be bought,

¹³ This shows that from the point of view of Herodotus, given the background Artabanus has laid before Xerxes when he has spoken his mind "freely" against the enterprise, that other factors play a part in the future Persian defeat. These factors include intangible and tangible issues: such as the inability to be content with what one has (See Croesus 1.27), one cannot always count on things remaining the same (there will not always be victory (Croesus and Solon, 1.29-34), plus practical reasons. Artabanus has told Xerxes the practical reasons for a huge failure; the combination of land, sea, and lack of harbours for safe mooring in times of storms, and the unknown in regard to feeding the army are necessarily important matters. These factors all could contribute to a defeat in Xerxes' ambition to conquer Greece. After Artabanus has spoken his mind, Xerxes sent his uncle back to Susa (7.46.1, 6; 7.47-53).

this despite the claims that nothing will prevent the Athenians and Spartans from fighting to the death for their freedom – neither material goods nor promises (8.144).

The third message these passages present is that before Mardonius makes the final decision whether or not to fight, he asks those Greeks who have joined forces with the Persians whether it is known or if there is a prophecy from any oracle that says that Persians will “perish in Hellas” (Hdt. 9.42.2). What is pertinent to the freedom versus slavery issue is that Herodotus reveals that some of the Greek leaders do have information but are afraid to voice it (9.42.2). Hence, a part of Artabanus’ concerns are fulfilled regarding food; the Persians do suspect whether freedom is more important to the Greeks than material goods. If Greeks or any other group partners with the Persians they lose their freedom and become slaves; they are afraid to speak their minds freely.¹⁴

The Decision-making first stage in the secondary category of the #1 principle offers the opportunity for those involved to decide whether or not their choice of actions will bring freedom or enslavement. The intermediate section of the first stage involves the action itself. The example passages illustrate a step further in carrying out the decision. Of the fifteen passages, eleven entail freedom or slavery from an external power. Four of the passages illustrate the action that cities take to maintain their internal freedom.

Aristagoras travels from the city of Miletus on the Asian coast to ask Cleomenes, king of Sparta to help the Ionians win their freedom from their external Persian overlords (Hdt. 5.49). According to Herodotus, Aristagoras only says he wants freedom for the Ionians as a pretence because he has plans to be the tyrant of the Ionian states himself. As part of his plan he gives the cities equality under the law (*isonomie*) to entice the cities to revolt. With external help from Cleomenes the revolt would have been successful. Cleomenes (with the help of his daughter Gorgo) refuses Aristagoras’ request (5.37.2; 5.51.1).¹⁵ Herodotus records a second attempt of the Ionians when a

¹⁴ Artabanus as uncle of Xerxes, does speak his mind freely. He is a member of the royal family and is not treated as a slave, but he is sent away from the army before the invasion occurs (7.53.1).

¹⁵ This venture of Aristagoras would draw the West and East into a major conflict.

faction of Chians attempts to enlist aid from the Greeks in Aegina with the same design and result that Aristagoras has in mind (Hdt. 8.132). Both requests end in failure.

The next step towards freedom or slavery involves a decision within the Ionian ranks. The decision draws in reminders to those who have been free to remember what it is like to be free. Significantly, Herodotus also opens up the topic that there are those who are ignorant of freedom. He has speakers state that those who have not been free cannot understand freedom but live within the confines of slavery knowing no other existence. Herodotus presents this case when he uses two Spartans as spokesmen from the mainland on their way to the Persian court in Susa (Hdt.7.135).¹⁶ Hydarnes, a Persian general, royally entertains them. While at table Hydarnes cannot understand why the Spartans “shun the King’s friendship” and because of that do not share in the bounties of the king that Hydarnes has (7.135.2).¹⁷ The Spartans pithily respond that if one has ever been free one would not use just spears, but axes to be free again (7.135.3).

The other passages that touch on freedom versus slavery are reminders to the eastern Mediterranean states of what it is like to be free and how to regain it in contrast to one who has never known freedom like Hydarnes. The Persians are closing in on the Ionians and Cyprians. Cyprus urges the Ionians to join forces in strategy with them to fight the Persians, but the Ionians refuse and with irony Herodotus has the Ionians remind the Cyprians to remember their suffering under slavery (Hdt. 5.109). The irony is that the Ionians themselves are now slaves and because of their refusal to accept wiser strategic advice in regard to each nation’s area of expertise, they continue to be enslaved. The Ionians appear not to recognize that they are slaves themselves; the Cyprians are enslaved after a year’s freedom (5.109.2; 5.116.1). Disunity in strategic planning appears to be the culprit.

¹⁶ Sperthias son of Aneristus and Bulis son Nicolaus are on their way to Xerxes to make amends on behalf of the Spartans who earlier had broken hospitality rules by killing Persian heralds (7.134.2).

¹⁷ This statement of Hydarnes reflects the same attitude toward material goods versus freedom that is expressed in Mardonius’ council on the mainland (9.41).

The last reminder passage in the intermediate section comes to the Ionians again from the Spartans (Hdt. 9.98). On the coast of Mycale Leutychides' herald tells the Ionians in direct speech to remember freedom on one hand and "Hebe" on the other hand. Freedom and the watchword "Hebe" are one and the same. To be free is to be free of shackles and to recall "Hebe" is to remember that it takes youth and its strength and willingness to fight in order to be free. (9.98.3).¹⁸ According to Herodotus the interpretation of Hebe can work in one of two ways. One is that the Persians will not understand what the name signifies or that the Persians understand through some means, but it will cause them to mistrust the Ionians, thus bringing discord among the ranks. Either way, Hebe works as a watchword to the Ionians and encourages disunity in the forces under Persia (9.98.4).

In each preceding passage the Persians are the external power that maintains slavery for the Ionians or the loss of freedom for the Cyprians. Powers within a city also cause enslavement. To fight is not always the only method to prevent a tyrant from gaining a foothold within a city. An assassination or a wound can effectively forestall a would-be oppressor. The Spartan Euryleon frees the Selinians with ulterior motives in mind (shades of Aristagoras and the Chian faction). Once Euryleon displays signs of an absolute ruler the people rise up and kill him (Hdt. 5.46.2). A wound in the thigh from a Milesian prevents Histiaeus in his attempt to return to Miletus as the tyrant. The Milesians relished their freedom since Aristagoras and have no desire to be ruled again (6.65.3). On the Greek mainland similar events take place except that the Athenians use guile and help from the Spartan armies to rid themselves of Hippias the tyrant (5.62-6).¹⁹ After thirty-six years (545-509 B.C.E.) the Athenians are free in their own city

¹⁸ This passage is problematic. Translators differ in the context. Some translate 'Hebe' as coming after freedom and some translate 'Hebe' as Hera: the *Landmark* translates 'after that' – Hera; Godley 1921 translates 'next' – Hebe; Holland translates 'with' – Hera; de Selincourt 1954 translates 'secondly' – Hera. The *OCD* says Hebe is the adolescent daughter of Hera and Zeus (670). Gilula 2003 78-79 says *Ebes* is the unanimous reading of all mss. Roscher had emended *Ebes* to *Eres* (Hera); How and Wells say this is a conjecture, which Hude and Rosen adopted. Hebe is the goddess of freedom and of victory; she is a symbol of athletic and military youth especially in Sparta (78-79).

¹⁹ The Athenians bribe the Pythian priestess to tell all Spartans who come to Delphi to free Athens. Does this suggest that the "means justify the ends" when freedom is the goal? The Spartans consider the words of an oracle to have more influence than their friendship with any mortal (6.63.1-2).

(6.65.3).²⁰ As often happens, factions arise once a city achieves freedom. Cleisthenes, an Alcmaeonid, persuades the *demos* to partner with him and with the greater number of people; he becomes their leader ((5.66.2)). These are significant passages for Herodotus (5.62-66). They illustrate Herodotus' view; he says that once people are free they become even greater than before (5.66.1). To show how important these five passages (5.62-66) are on how Athens gains freedom and the consequences of freedom, Herodotus introduces the passages with the first person singular pronoun three times in the first five lines (5.66.1).

Once Athens gains its freedom internally it faces the external enemy. Xerxes says that once the Greeks hear of his power they will surrender their strange (*idian*) freedom (Hdt. 7.147.1). This is another indicator besides material goods that the Persians do not understand popular freedom where the people make the decisions. With Xerxes preparing to sail to Greece Herodotus uses the first person nominative singular pronoun and the dative "me" (*moi*), three times in the first three lines to show his strong views despite the disapproval of the Greeks when he says it is Athens with the help of the gods who saves Hellas (7.139.1). Herodotus says the Athenians could have left the country or surrendered to the Persians, instead they take action (7. 139-143). As is necessary, the gods are brought in with Delphi and aid in providing support and unity with the rest of the Greeks who desire to be free. At the same time, the Delphians pray to the oracle whose message is to pray to the winds to be Greek allies; a great storm begins to boil and many ships in the Persian fleet are shipwrecked (7.178, 188-189).²¹

Alexander king of Macedonia, ruler of one of the states that is not free, still risks all to come by night to warn the Spartan Pausanias at Plataea about the conditions and plans of the Persian army. He says that he is a Greek with the assumption that all Greeks are naturally free; he does not want Hellas to be enslaved nor for himself to continue to be a slave to the Persians (Hdt. 7.45). To meet the enemy and to have victory, unity is required; Pausanias' message to the Athenian army is in direct speech

²⁰ The freedom from Hippias occurs before Aristagoras approaches Cleomenes for help in the Ionian revolt from Darius (5.65.5).

²¹ This is a case where Herodotus relates two versions, both Athens and Delphi pray to different gods.

that states it is freedom or slavery for Hellas (9.60). Thus, from the first decision to fight for freedom to the preparations, Herodotus shows that the only way to gain or maintain freedom is to fight.

In the earlier section of the *Histories* Herodotus relates how the Medes won their freedom from the Assyrians (Hdt. 1.95). Xerxes, as a direct descendent of Cyrus who gave the Persians freedom, becomes king when all the sons are vying for the position. Cyrus led the Persians in battle to free themselves from the slavery of the Medes (7.2-3). Demaratus the exiled Spartan king, tells Xerxes that the Greeks will fight any number of Persians in order to be free, but as it is seen with the Persians, Xerxes does not understand what it is for a people to be free (7.103.5). Before Alexander approaches Pausanias' camp secretly at night, Alexander comes to the Athenians as an envoy from Mardonius in quest of an Athenian partnership. The Athenians in no uncertain terms tell Alexander that they will fight the Persians to the best of their ability as long as the sun holds its course and they trust the gods for heaven's support (8.143.1-2). In other words, they will never surrender to the Persians and become slaves "like you, Alexander."

Thus, Herodotus demonstrates the required procedure to follow in order to gain or to maintain freedom in the secondary section of Hansen's first principle. The primary first principle defines the two classes, freemen or slaves (Hdt. 1.116 and 2.134-135). In 6.11 Herodotus displays the procedure to be followed: the decision, the preparation in equipment or strategy, and finally, the willingness to work hard and to fight for freedom. The three obstacles that prevent a people from obtaining or maintaining freedom are an unwillingness to work, a decision not to fight, and a lack of unity among the forces. In the final section of the secondary principle Herodotus leaves no doubt that once the Athenians are free and not slaves they will fight forever to remain free.

In terms of Hansen's #2 principle Cyrus' parentage means that his status is that of a free person (*eleutheros*), a legally free-born citizen, a member of one polis and not another. Associated with the adjective *eleutheros* is the confirmation that free foreigners are included when the noun *eleutheria* is used in classical Athens; it denotes citizenship

by descent. The employment of the noun means that there is a political value that forms the basis of one perspective in democratic equality (Hans. 2010 2-3).²²

Herodotus does not present a primary example of a legally born citizen in connection to the term that brings freedom into a passage, but he provides the historical descent to show how Pericles is a citizen. He is the descendent of a king and also of Cleisthenes, who gives the Athenians their ten tribes and their democratic state in 509 B.C.E. (Hdt. 6.131.1-2). The status of Pericles is not irrevocably stated, but his ancestry as outlined by Herodotus indicates his station more strongly than merely touching on principle #2.

The passage with the description on how the Athenian generals come to a democratic decision on whether or not to fight Darius, king of the Persians (Hdt. 6.109-110), in the Marathon battle (490 B.C.E.) secondarily touches on the topic of being free-born (6.109) inasmuch as it illustrates the exercising of citizen rights. Two irreversible factors demonstrate the generals' legally free-born citizenship status and the method they use to form their decision to fight. In the first place, it is obligatory for all citizens in "good health and of military age" to serve in the army.²³ Each of the ten tribes elects a general.

According to Herodotus the magistrate chosen by lot as the "magistrate for war" (*polemarchos*) is the eleventh of the generals (Hdt. 6.109.1-2).²⁴ If the generals were not citizens they would not have the right to decide among themselves whether or not to engage in battle. The method the generals use to determine their decision is through the vote. The generals would not exercise the right to vote if they were not full-fledged citizens in a democratic society.

²² Aristotle states that democrats believed that all *eleutheroi* (by descent) should be equal in everything; "those who are equal in respect are equal absolutely" (Arist. *Pol.* 1992, 1301a28).

²³ M.H.Hansen 1999 95-96, 100. Metics also had to do military service.

²⁴ According to Strassler, ed. *The Landmark Herodotus*, there is some discrepancy between Herodotus and the *Aristotelian Constitution of Athens* (22.2) on whether or not the generals are chosen by lot or by election. See (Appendix A. #9, Hdt. 6.109.1-2).

The general Miltiades speaks to the *polemarch* Callimachus, telling him that his vote will be the deciding factor as to whether or not Athens will be enslaved or maintain its freedom. The generals are divided in their opinions - some to fight and some to refrain from fighting. Herodotus concludes Miltiades' important direct speech before the vote, on the note that it is Callimachus who will earn the honour to make the country free or to permit it to fall back into slavery. Direct speech is one of the patterns that Herodotus employs to illustrate the importance of a decision between freedom and slavery (Hdt. 6.109.3, 6). The generals are free-born and demonstrate their rights and privileges. Initially, they use the privilege to disagree among themselves, but upon the use of the majority vote from the *polemarch*, the representative of the entire Athenian *demos* who has been chosen by lot, they arrive at an agreement to join in battle against the Medes (Persians).

The vote among the generals who are free-born leads into Hansen's principle #3. Principle #3 focuses on the metaphorical opposition of *eleutheria* (a free-born citizenship by descent) that forms the basis of democratic equality and its opposition – enslavement – by a despotic (master) ruler, a tyrant (*tyrannos*). Hansen draws an analogy on the concepts of freedom and slavery from the paradigm of the microscopic household (*oikos*) with the macroscopic city-state (*polis*). Herodotus illustrates the tension between democracy and tyranny from the microscopic city to the macroscopic geographical larger regions. The selected examples for discussion from Herodotus are not hypothetical models, but are passages that speak directly to the primary category of principle #3, namely democracy versus tyranny. The passages cover the city-state of Athens, the regions of Perinthus on the northern banks of the Sea of Marmora, the Ionian coastal cities on the eastern shores of the Aegean Sea, and finally the great battles that Greece fights against Xerxes, king of the Persians (480/79 B.C.E.). In each of these selections Herodotus relates how bitter battles for freedom are fought in some states, while other states make the choice not to battle but to accept tyranny and Persian domination. Herodotus focuses first on how the city-state of Athens fights desperately for its freedom when Hippias, son of Pisistratus, rules Athens. Contrary to Herodotus' usual style of objective writing, he employs the first person singular personal pronoun four times to show the strength of his support for Athens' desire to regain freedom from Hippias (Hdt. 5.55.1, 62). At the beginning of his account he writes once, "I will show" how Athens

frees herself from tyranny. He repeats the first personal singular pronoun three times to indicate how important these passages are for him and for Athens; it is the story of freedom (the threat to democracy) versus tyranny.

Herodotus begins the Athenian narration on democracy versus tyranny in his customary smooth style after the tyrant Aristagoras visits Sparta.²⁵ Herodotus uses the image of Aristagoras travelling over to Athens and the audience preparing itself to hear how Athens wins its freedom from tyranny (Hdt. 5.55.1). Recently Athens has endured tyranny; Herodotus informs his audience that the last four years of tyranny were not good times, in fact even worse than earlier periods of tyranny. This tyranny was “ever more absolute than before” (5.55.1). With the help of Sparta Athens frees itself from the Peisistratid rule (545-509 B.C.E.) and as Herodotus says, although Athens has always been great, because she is free now, she is greater than before (62-66.1). Herodotus reiterates that because Athens is free she becomes even more powerful with examples of the neighbours she subdues (5.77-79). The victories of Athens over her neighbours are not enough for Herodotus. He voices his view that freedom, meaning democracy “is a good thing” (5.78.1); it embodies equality (*isonomien*) and free speech (*isegoria*). This is another one of the infrequent times that Herodotus expresses his own positive opinion. He says further that “each one (individual man) is zealous to achieve for himself”, which means the individual counts; he is important and he is responsible for his own actions and speech. When under an autocrat the Athenians were like their neighbours (the nuance is derogatory), but now with equality among themselves they are “first of all” (5.78.1).

While Herodotus regards highly those who work hard and fight forcefully and steadfastly for freedom he recognizes and accepts that there are alternate ways to maintain freedom. Harpagus of Persia takes the Teians’ city, but the Teians sail away to found another city in their quest for freedom (Hdt. 1.168). The Phocaeans and the Teians are the only Ionians who, Herodotus says, cannot “endure slavery” (1.169.1). The Teians could and would not accept slavery, but most of the rest of the Ionians on the Asian mainland and on the islands battle the Persians and then give up or surrender

²⁵ Aristagoras goes to Sparta to ask for help in the Ionian revolt against Persia (Hdt. 5.49-55).

themselves to Cyrus' despots. Herodotus says that he understands that Bias of Priene counselled the Ionians to sail away like the Teians to found a city and before the destruction, Thales of Miletus suggests that the Ionians band together to face the Persians. Herodotus approvingly says that the advice of these two men is good (1.170). Slavery more than freedom appears to suit these Ionian tyrants according to what – Herodotus is careful to say – is only hearsay. Another method that Herodotus relates concerning the maintenance of freedom is that once the Milesians have a “taste of freedom” following the departure of the tyrant Aristagoras, they have no wish to live under a tyrant, consequently they wound Histiaeus when he attempts to return to Miletus (6.5).

As mentioned above often the direct speech patterns in Herodotus involve a decision regarding freedom or slavery/ democracy or tyranny. In two passages, one offer of the choice lies in the direct speech of the Scythians to the Ionians at the Ister Bridge on the choice of freedom or tyranny under Darius. The other choice is when the tyrants of Cyrus address the Ionians on the same matter (Hdt. 4.132.2; 5.109.2). One feature that is important to keep in mind is that the type of freedom offered to the Ionians is not the kind of freedom/democracy that the Athenians desire and gain. The freedom for the Ionians under discussion is an internal freedom. The city-state is free to rule itself and to be ruled subject to an internal tyrant of whom an external power appoints. In theory the domestic affairs of the city are not within the jurisdiction of the external power.

²⁶

Besides a city-state, a tribe, or the Ionian coastline, the mainland of Greece comes under the threat of the despotic power of Persia (Hdt. 7.139; 8.77; 9.60). According to Herodotus who states in no uncertain terms, Athens is the leading power in Greece and the Athenians save “Hellas” (7.139.1, 6). With the mainland in such a perilous situation two factors in Herodotus' view determine the reason why Greece is able to maintain its freedom (in Athens' case her democratic political system) and defeat

²⁶The different types of freedom will be discussed under Hansen's principle #7. Further passages that offer similar circumstances in the primary category to the ones covered above are as follows: 1.96; 2. 172-3; 3.80-82; 4.136, 139, 142; 5.46, 49, 78, 91-92, 109, 116, 139, 142; 6. 121-124; 7.2-3, 135, 138.

the impending danger of tyranny. The first factor is that of unity with those willing to fight the Persians; the second factor is that under this dire threat the Athenians, and Herodotus agrees, maintain a singularity in purpose “under heaven” and with Delphi (7.139.5-6, 178.1-2). Delphi seeks the knowledge of the god and the oracle says to pray to the wind. The wind rises to the occasion and destroys Persian ships (7.188). Athens and Delphi send word to the Greeks who desire freedom and those who are still free to rise to the call of Athens and Delphi. Herodotus says that he will not deny or permit others to disagree with oracles, but he still considers it worthwhile to cite an oracle that prophesies “Freedom” will dawn upon Hellas; “Victory grants “Freedom” to Greece (8.77). Herodotus leaves it to the audience to form its own opinion on oracles. At the same time to include the oracles in the narration suggests that Herodotus’ view to seek advice from the gods is an advantageous factor in the Greek victory.

One more reliable and realistic anecdote within the primary category that relates to freedom is the matter of unity for Greece (Hdt. 9.60). In order to defeat the Persians, Pausanias, in direct speech at Plataea, calls for help from the Athenians to meet together in battle against their enemy. In this “great issue which must give freedom or slavery to Hellas . . . we must protect each other as best we can” (9.60 1-2). This passage bluntly states the necessity of a unified front, which is seen from earlier sources that disunity and disorder bring defeat.²⁷

The passages under the secondary category of principle #3 that touch on freedom/ democracy and tyranny do not clearly present the message that the issue is democracy in opposition to tyranny. Rather, there is a hazy line drawn between the two political systems. Several selected examples provide a sense of the indistinctness in the separate systems. The Medes stage a revolt against the Assyrians (1229-708 B.C.E.) to win their freedom (Hdt. 1.96, 97-103). After winning freedom in 708 B.C.E., Deioces cleverly and gradually acquires the power to become the Mede tyrant, thus the Medes are once again under tyranny. Mardonius, a Persian general under Darius, sets up internal democracies for the Ionian cities, but they are still under the external power of Persia (6.43). When Xerxes invades mainland Greece there are some Greeks who

²⁷ More examples from the text regarding disunity and disorder are: 1.168-170; 4.132; 5.109; 6.5.

refuse to give the customary bread and water, which means they do not accept external tyranny (7. 138-139). In the famous Persian Constitutional Debate, Otanes states that he prefers the system of equality where the power of the multitude reigns; he says his family will not rule nor be ruled (3.80.6, 83.2).²⁸ It is unclear whether or not there is the assumption of an external power (3.80.6). Otanes says the multitude rules domestically, but that does not mean an external power does not control inter-state relations.

The issue of the internal multitude ruling in a city brings us to Hansen's principle #4 which in general terms concerns the opposition between the poor and the rich. Specifically, Hansen narrows down the definitions of the poor person and the rich person. *Eleutheros* means a free person; in some contexts it indicates a poor person, but not always, or speaking in the plural sense it can mean a multitude of (poor) free persons. Some of the multitude may not be poor in material goods, but still are not men of great wealth. The wealthy men who rule in small groups are members of an oligarchy.²⁹ Principle #4 focuses on the opposition between the oligarchy and a democracy. According to Aristotle a political system is a democracy, and so "free", when a majority of the free and "poor" rule the *polis*. When a minority of the rich and wellborn are in power the political order is an oligarchy. In principle #4, "the opposite of democratic freedom is not slavery under a tyrant, but under an oligarchic government"³⁰

In the Persian Constitutional Debate, Otanes and Megabyzus discuss the issues of equality (*isonomien*), oligarchy (*oligarxie*), and the multitude (*demos*) (Hdt. 3.80.6, 81.1, 82.3). For Otanes the freedom to have equality means that he prefers a democratic political system where some freemen are poor and some are wealthy, but all have equal political rights and privileges. After stating the dangers of a monarchic system, Otanes states his preference for equality; he does not define exactly what he means when he says power should be in the hands of the multitude. Megabyzus follows

²⁸ Similar political systems are found in 3.139, 142; 537; 8.149. Demaratus, the exiled king of Sparta touches on Greek mainland Freedom. This type of freedom does not have external powers; he tells Xerxes that poverty is the element that breeds freedom (Hdt. 7.102).

²⁹ Aristotle writes in his *Politics* of "the sovereignty of the freemen, the mass of citizens who are not particularly men of wealth: (1281b22-25). The wealthy population according to Aristotle is the aristocracy, the oligarchy (1294a16-17).

³⁰ Hansen 2010 4-5.

with the condemnation of putting power in the hands of a monarchy and the multitude and then cites the virtues of an oligarchy. Darius enters the discussion stating that neither system is best for the welfare of the state; an oligarchy will unravel into factions and conflicts with the strong man coming out on top as the monarch (3.82.3-4).

Through the vehicle of the Constitutional Debate, Herodotus imparts the essence of the systems of government that are a democracy, an oligarchy, and a monarchy. The Debate occurs after the assassination of the Magi when the possibility of a different Persian political system might be put into effect (Hdt. 3.79).³¹ Undoubtedly, Herodotus is not present nor has he an eyewitness to relate the gist of the dialogue but he uses the Debate to communicate the theories of different political systems. Herodotus deems these systems appropriate for his study as he demonstrates in passages some of the ramifications of the different types of political structures. In line with Hansen's principle #4, Herodotus relates examples of oligarchies and their slaves. The assumption in Herodotus' examples is that those who are rich and have the power are unlikely to give up their authority and support a democratic system where the multitude has the freedom to rule. In the primary category of #4 only two passages come close to the principle that Hansen presents. When Persia threatens the Ionians and the Cyprians, the tyrants of Cyprus inform the Ionians that the Ionians have the power to make Cyprus and Ionia free (5.109). Herodotus says "the tyrants (*tyrannoi*) of Cyprus (5.109.1); in this case with the plural of tyrant the audience understands that Herodotus groups the tyrants into an oligarchy."³²

The other oligarchy concerns the Spartan envoys when they approach the Athenians after Alexander the messenger from Mardonius the Persian general, offers to make an agreement with Athens (Hdt. 8.142). The envoys speak to the issue of slavery versus freedom in the direct speech pattern indicating the seriousness of the circumstances (8.143.2). The problem with putting this in the Hansen principle #4 is that

³¹ The assassination and the discussion occur after the reign of Cambyses (530-522) son of Cyrus.

³² The Cyprians and the Ionians lack a united front, which brings victory to the Persians. This causes the Cyprians and its oligarchy to be enslaved once more after a year of freedom from an external power and for the Ionians to continue in their station of slavery (5.116).

the Spartan system of political government cannot be called a direct democracy nor does it follow the exact definition of an oligarchy. Selincourt calls the institutions of Sparta “strange institutions” (118). I call Sparta’s political system a mixed oligarchy.³³

There is one possible set of passages concerning #4 that may touch in a scanty and obscure manner on an oligarchy. The passages concern the Teians and Ionians (Hdt. 1.168-170). It is possible that Teians are ruled under an oligarchy, but because of a slightly looser type of government than a tyranny under one man, they are able to sail away to colonize another place. This suggests that their choice for freedom is worth the hardships of settling into a new environment: “one does not endure slavery“(1.168, 169.1). The rest of the Ionians, except for the Milesians, battle with fervour but when the Persians defeat them, they settle down to slavery rather than fight to the end or leave. Some of these Ionians cities may have had groups of wealthy men ruling them as oligarchies such as Cyprus (5.109); Herodotus does not say, but he says the advice to leave is “good” counsel. In Herodotus’ view the discomforts in and the adjustments to a new place are preferable to slavery (1.170).³⁴

The physical discomfort and hardship of a new place are a metaphor that closely corresponds and resembles what occurs on a political level. Hansen’s principle #5 describes this “kind of freedom (*eleutheria*) to be found in democracies only.” For classical Athens that has experienced tyrants, the democratic system is a new order that requires adjustments. Hansen describes this new political arrangement; all freeborn Athenian citizens are to “participate” in government institutions by taking turns in public offices. It means every citizen is to take his turn “to rule and to be ruled in turns”.³⁵

One of the most interesting passages within the context of freedom in Herodotus is Otares’ comment that he chooses neither “to rule nor to be ruled” (Hdt. 3.83). Otares is speaking as a Persian in a monarchic system. At the beginning of the Constitutional

³³ The topic of Spartan government is covered more fully under principle #7.

³⁴ Another pattern besides the freedom versus slavery direct speech is present in Herodotus (1.170). Bias of Priene counsels the Ionians to sail away. They do not follow the advice and become slaves. In the eyes of Herodotus this is a negative state. Often when good counsel or reasonable counsel is offered but not followed, disaster is the outcome.

³⁵ Hansen 2010 5-6.

Debate Herodotus raises several issues when he has Otanes voice his preference on ruling. One issue is the irony of a subject/slave (even a noble) who openly states his personal desire within the political system in which he lives. It indicates that democracy “is in the air.” Secondly, take note that he speaks for himself and for his family only, not for a city or a state. Thirdly, Herodotus appears to take pleasure in the fact that it is a Persian who states the beginning of “Greek political philosophy” at an earlier time (522 B.C.E.) than when Athens becomes democratic under Cleisthenes (510/09 B.C.E.).³⁶

In another ironical instance, Herodotus has Histiaeus, a tyrant, bring to the forefront the term democracy (*demokratia*) – the first time it appears in the text (Hdt. 4.137). Histiaeus’ aim is to influence the Ionians at the Ister Bridge not to accept the Scythian offer of freedom by breaking the bridge and not to follow the advice of Miltiades to break the bridge and accept the offer of a way to gain freedom. The Ionians choose not to break the bridge but to remain under the kingship of Darius with his appointed tyrants; Histiaeus reminds them of what they would lose if they follow the advice of Miltiades. They would lose property, wealth, and power, instead of experiencing equality for all in governing, free speech, rights, and privileges.³⁷ This is also another example of a pattern whereby advice is not taken, which leads back into slavery. The rulers retain their privileged positions but are still slaves as are their subjects. As Herodotus says, “equality is good thing” for the people, but Histiaeus strongly objects to equality because the cities would demand democracy/equality if they were to break away from Darius the Persian king (4.137).

³⁶ How and Wells 578. Opinions vary as to when Athens becomes a democracy. There are those who say that Solon (594 B.C.E.) sets forth the fundamental principles. Others convincingly say that it is in 509 B.C.E. that Cleisthenes along with the support of the citizens puts the democratic political system in place. Other translators than Godley have used the term “democracy” earlier in the text. I have checked the translations. The Greek word “*demos*” is translated as democracy. Powell offers the word “democracy” as a fourth definition for *demos* on page 85. The term “*demokratia*” is used for the first time in 4.137.

³⁷ Aristotle lists the features of democracy: Elections to office by all from all, rule of all over each other in turn, Offices filled by lot, No tenure of office or property qualifications (*Pol.* 1317b17.2-7). Isocrates says much the same with fewer details (*Isoc.* 20.21). Euripides has Theseus say that the city (Athens) is not free; it is not under one man, rather “the people rule” in a government that lasts a year. The wealthy and the poor man have equal power (*Supp.* 406-408).

Herodotus offers a microscopic mirror of democracy in action when he describes how the generals decide whether or not to meet Darius in battle at Marathon in 490 B.C.E. Miltiades tells Callimachus that he, the *polemarch*, has the “deciding vote” (Hdt. 6.109.3-4). Isocrates says that each one casts his vote on his own behalf (20.21). The generals mirror the democratic assembly on a smaller scale; the Athenian democratic assembly has sovereign authority. Consequently, the Athenians meet Darius in battle because of the majority vote (Arist. *Pol.* 1317b17.2-7). Thus, the generals employ their right to free speech, their right to speak their minds. They are at liberty to abide by the strictures and methods in coming to a decision in a democratic system – the majority rules.

Hansen’s principle #6 follows through on the generals’ right to speak one’s mind (Hdt. 6.109). Hansen states that principle #6 is the most controversial form of democratic liberty (Hans. 2010 6). It not only means that the idealistic aspect of democracies is the freedom to speak one’s mind, but also to live as one pleases without oppression. Clarity between the public and private spheres of life is at risk with the principle. According to Hansen the specific feature of #6 is the right to speak one’s mind, which is the licence of speech and the courage to speak up (*parrhesia*). Hansen’s principle #6 is in line with several of Herodotus’ passages. The Persian Constitutional Debate sets the base for democratic principles. In the Debate the three interlocutors each speaks his mind (3.80-83). Otanes takes a step further when he says the holders of office, chosen by lot, are accountable for their actions, that is, they are responsible for what they do and say (3.80.6). This issue involves the public sphere whereas towards the end of the Debate Otanes covers the private sector as well when he says that he himself will not rule or be ruled nor will any of his family be subject to anyone “of you”. These latter two dictates primarily focus on the private sphere, but they infringe into the public realm unless Otanes and his family live in isolation out of an urban area (3.83.2-3). As Hansen points out, this is controversial, yet there are three examples in Herodotus.

In Sparta under the Spartan type of democratic freedom, two men, Sperthias and Bules, of their own free will decide to make atonement to Xerxes in Susa for Sparta’s killing of Darius’ heralds (Hdt. 7.134.2). Along with their free decision to journey to

Xerxes, they stop off on the Asian coast to call on Hydarnes, a Persian general. Within the Persian region these two men follow through courageously with their democratic right of the direct speech pattern on the issue of freedom: Hydarnes knows how to be a slave, but he has no knowledge of what it is like to be free (7.135.3). Leutyichides also a Spartan, more closely touches on the right to live as he pleases and to speak with freedom. He commands his ships to sail to the coast of Mycale. In direct speech he proclaims to the Ionians to “remember freedom and the battle cry Hebe” (9.98.2-3).³⁸ Leutyichides offers the Ionians a choice. Finally, Herodotus takes his topic of the right to live as one pleases to Athens (5.78). He tells his audience what many say while oppressed under tyrants, the Athenians are craven under a master, but once free they each achieve for himself. This comment assumes that each Athenian now has the right of free speech and lives as he pleases within the limits that Athenians impose upon themselves.

Hansen’s #6 principle incorporates the controversial right to live as one pleases and at the same time the specific right to free speech and it includes Athens and Sparta in passages that touch on the secondary category (Hdt. 8.142-3). Athens’ and Sparta’s freedom with the right to live as one pleases and with the right to free speech asserts itself when the Spartan envoys come to the Athenians regarding the message Alexander brings from Mardonius on the agreement between Greece and Persia. Under the type of free government that Sparta has the envoys say and do what they wish or it appears that they do what they are told to say and do. It is not clear. The Athenians with their right of freedom within the limits of popular law say they will defend themselves to the best of their ability which means they will never give up (8.143.1).

In the context of Persia’s right to speak freely and to live as one pleases according to Hansen’s #6 there is a decided difference from Athens and from Sparta in the interpretation of freedom. Xerxes claims his right to be king since his grandfather Cyrus gave the Persians freedom (Hdt. 7.2-3). There is an apparent tension in regard to speaking freely within the boundaries of the Persian empire. Xerxes asks his uncle

³⁸ Hebe (*hebe*) meaning youth, symbolizes adolescent strength and spirit (*OCD*, 670). Leutyichides reminds the Ionians that they must remember their strength and spirit in the fight for freedom.

Artabanus for advice; he knows that Artabanus will speak freely because of his uncle's eventual support for the plan to march on Greece. When Xerxes seeks further advice, Artabanus now counsels Xerxes not to march against Hellas; Xerxes is not pleased with the advice and sends Artabanus back to Susa. This is an example of speaking feely within the monarchical system. As long as the subordinate speaks in support of the ruler all is well; if there is a difference of opinion the monarch in the type of freedom that Cyrus brings to Persia makes his own decision.

Likewise, Xerxes bids Demaratus, exiled king of Sparta, to give his advice on the march against Greece (Hdt.7.101.4). Demaratus carefully reminds Xerxes that he is bidden to speak (7.102). Once he voices the reminder, Demaratus gives reasons why the invasion is not a good idea because Greeks and especially Spartans are unconquerable. At the end of his advice Demaratus repeats his reminder that he, Demaratus, speaks the truth: "you constrain me to speak truly" (7.104.1). In these passages the dependants give advice only upon request. This is not free speech; free speech is when an equal speaks as and when he wishes to speak. A dependent speaks freely or truly when he is asked for an opinion. In the end Xerxes follows his own inclination.³⁹ (This incident follows the motif of counsels not followed; it ends in disaster; in this case, Greece defeats Xerxes.) Sparta and the Persians both consider themselves free, but to examine in detail the execution of freedom of speech, let alone to live as one pleases, is to observe that freedom comes in different forms and types depending on the states and the conditions.

In principle #7 Hansen states that *eleutheria* often means that a city is independent or autonomous (*autonomia*); an external power does not dominate a city-state. The opposite of the free-state is a dependent (*hupekoos*) state, an enslaved state; it is a state that is subject to an external sovereign regardless of its constitution. The latter is in contrast to a democratic freedom that has internal sovereignty.

³⁹ For the Persians a similar situation arises in Thebes with Mardonius and his counsel (9.41). On the other hand, the Corinthian Socles in his free speech to the Spartans chooses to attempt to persuade the Spartans not to return the tyrant Hippias to Athens (5.91.2, 92a). On the subject of both Artabanus and Demaratus concerning their speaking freely/truly to Xerxes, Forsdyke comments that to speak "freely" characterizes a tyrannical rule; free speech is a characterization of democracy (344).

Oligarchies, some tyrannies, and monarchies as well as democracies are free in the autonomous sense. That is, there is freedom of the city; democratic liberty is freedom within the city (Hans. 6-7).

Athens is the most famous of the cities that has democratic freedom. Otañes paves the way in the Constitutional Debate for an Athenian democratic freedom in Herodotus' *Histories* when he proposes popular government; the people form the laws, the magistrates are chosen by lot, and the citizens have equality to rule and be ruled in turn. Athens does not have an external sovereign (Hdt. 3.80.1-2, 6, 83.1). Sparta is also an autonomous city-state with an internal constitution and government and yet does not have a democratic political system. The closest description of the Spartan system of government is a mixed oligarchy with checks and balances. The people are free, yet as Demaratus tells Xerxes, they are "not wholly free . . . the law (Great *Rhetra*) is their master" (7.104.4). The government is made up of two hereditary kings, a Council of Elders – thirty including the kings and ephors. Acclamation is the vehicle used for selecting the ephors and a public assembly (3.2; 5.46.1; 6.56-61,6). All male Spartans attend the public assembly; it elects the council, the ephors, and acclamation generally passes legislation. The powers of each office are unclear, but what is clear is that Sparta is an autonomous state (Arist. *Pol.* 2 1271a18-2.1270b6).⁴⁰

The other autonomous political systems are those with kings; some independent states have tyrants (a one-man rule who acquires power unconstitutionally, outside of the law). Cyrus (557-530 B.C.E.) before he becomes king of Persia convinces the Persians that if they obey him, they will gain freedom from the Medes who are their overlords (Hdt. 1.126.3-6). The Persians agree to revolt successfully against Astyages (descendant of Deioces) and willingly declare Cyrus to be their king. The other type of

⁴⁰ Sealey 1976 70-74. The term *autonomia* is believed to have been coined when the Delian League was formed as an alliance (478/7 B.C.E.) against the Persian Empire (Ostwald 1982 46). The prominent feature of the Spartan government is its ambiguity. The two kings have the right to make war with the consent of the assembly. The council (*geousia*), sets policy, is the pre-deliberative body for the assembly, and is the Supreme Court. On occasion the kings are tried before the council and the ephors. The ephors also advise the kings on certain matters (Strassler, Appendix B).

an independent state that Herodotus portrays is the tyranny that the tyrant Deioces forms with wily gradual methods until he has the sole power of the Medes (1.95-100).

Herodotus presents many passages that describe the enslaved state. An example of one is when Chian Ionians sail to Aegina to request help in freeing their state from the Persians (Hdt. 8.132.1). In reality the purpose of the Chians and those from other enslaved states is to set up their own tyrannies or tyrannical oligarchies, while giving the impression that they want complete freedom for their cities. An exception is the situation at the Ister Bridge in Scythia. The Ionian tyrants choose to remain under the sovereignty of Persia in order to maintain their power and wealth (4.137).⁴¹ Thus, Herodotus presents the political systems of democracy, tyranny, a monarchy, and an oligarchy with the variations in their definitions of freedom and the manner in which they exercise the differences.

The final two principles #8 and #9 are Hansen's definitions of philosophical freedom. In principle #8 Hansen cites Plato's dialogues and Xenophon's *Memorabilia* as works on self-government or self-control. To take the condition of self-control or self-government and to apply it to a person or to a people is to regard this state as self-discipline. If there is not self-control or self-discipline, the person or state is a slave to his/her desires; he/she is shackled and unfree.

Herodotus provides an interesting passage on self-control when Xerxes expresses his desire to march on Greece (Hdt. 7.18). Artabanus clearly says that at first he is "loath" for his nephew to give the "reign" to his "youthful" desires. A vision that Artabanus has causes him to change his mind and to support Xerxes' plans. Artabanus at the moment is also caught up in a frenzy of desire – self-control and reason have taken leave of him (or perhaps he deems it is safer to go along with the king). The outcome of the invasion as Herodotus later relates is defeat. (The defeat follows the

⁴¹ Other autonomous states with kings in the primary category are: Lydia, King Croesus (560-546 B.C.E.), Amasis of Egypt (570-525/20 B.C.E.), the Perinthians, the Scythians (1.26; 2.172.5, 173.1; 4.110, 133). The passages that touch on the autonomous or enslaved states are: (1.94, 168-170; 5.49, 64-66, 77, 78, 91, 92; 6.11; 7.104.4, 135; 8.142; 9.41,45, 60-1).

pattern of advice not taken after Artabanus has second thoughts on the invasion counselling Xerxes not to march into Greece (7.49-51).

Another passage demonstrates the advantage of not losing control (Hdt. 7.139.1). When the Persians threaten Athens, the Athenians choose to lead the rest of Greece against Xerxes and his forces rather than to panic and surrender or to leave their country. The outcome is that they remain in control of themselves leading Greece eventually to safety and freedom.⁴²

In the secondary category of Hansen's principle #8, Aristagoras attempts to lure Cleomenes king of Sparta, into invading the Asian mainland to free Ionia from the Persians (Hdt. 5.49, 51). In this case, two examples illustrate self-control and a lack of self-control. Aristagoras wishes to free Ionia in order to gain his own personal power from the Persian overlords. However, Cleomenes (with the advice of his nine-year old daughter, Gorgo) refuses the temptation despite all the riches Aristagoras describes that would await the invasion. Sparta and Cleomenes survive to maintain their freedom; Aristagoras comes to a bad end.⁴³

Lastly, Hansen's principle #9 offers a view on freedom in the sense of leisure. Freedom as leisure according to Aristotle concerns the purpose of life. There is a difference between what one does because he/she wants to do it, like reading, studying, making music, or in doing something in order to acquire something else. In Herodotus, there does not appear to be the freedom of leisure as described in principle #9 in the primary category. Three passages in the secondary category touch vaguely on the freedom of leisure, which means to do what one wants to do without any motive involved other than happiness.

One passage involves King Amasis of Egypt who spent his afternoons drinking and jesting with friends after he spent his mornings serving judgements and ruling (Hdt. 2.173). In a convoluted manner the Athenians who are now free have the freedom to

⁴² The following citations distinctly exhibit self-control or lack of self-control in a single person or in a group 3.81.2; 7.104; 8.77.1.

⁴³ The citations that touch on the primary category are: 8.80.6; 5.91-92; 7.57, 139.

“each one . . . zealous to achieve for himself” (5.78.1). In a first reading and most likely what Herodotus has in mind is that each Athenian wishes to prove his valour on the battlefield. However, it could be interpreted differently. Perhaps all Athenian men cannot be warriors. They could pursue other activities, which they themselves choose if they are wealthy enough or are not required on the battlefield.

One other passage can be construed in a somewhat similar way. Lawlessness hampers the Medes, which prevents them from carrying on their “business” - their usual way of life (Hdt. 1.97-98.6). They set up a system of government (Herodotus says that probably Deioces’ friends do the persuading.), which means they ask Deioces to be their king to maintain order. Most likely it is for their own livelihoods, but there may be those who choose to take up a life of contemplation or another activity that allows them a special pleasure without the need to earn a living. A disorderly city prevents any of these activities.

These last three examples are only conjectures – Herodotus does not use the word *eleutheria* there – which can be handily argued to the point where one can say that Herodotus does not have the freedom of leisure in mind for his *Histories*. Thus, aside from principle #9, principles #s 1-8 work very well with Herodotus’ anecdotes and tales on freedom versus slavery.

Chapter 2.

The Freedom Motif

Chapter 2 demonstrates the role that the freedom motif plays in Herodotus' narratives of the conflicts on the mainland of both Greece and Asia as well as other regions. Herodotus' enquiries cover the last part of the eighth century through to and including the first part of the fifth century. The freedom motif acts as a guide to the reader in the conflicts between the East and the West. As the leading motif in the clashes it presents the reasons why freedom comes to fruition or fails to maintain its position in city-states and empires. At the same time, the Hansen principles discussed in Chapter 1 serve as a basis for the freedom motif and the following brief run-down of the historical events serve to form a background for the freedom motif's role in the *Histories*.

The freedom motif runs through the books of Herodotus beginning with Herodotus' preface, where he sets the stage for his research on why the Greeks and Persians clash. Herodotus identifies himself and explains that his purpose is to make known and to ensure that the deeds of Greeks and non-Greeks will not be forgotten (1.1). His initial comments in his *Histories*, which concern the deeds of men, implicitly convey the message that impartiality underlines his entire work. Nearly always he gives notice of his even-handed approach when he says he is not sure about something; he offers differing versions of the same event or story; he is not an eyewitness; he has not heard of the occurrence from an eyewitness.

In the beginning of the *Histories* (716-547/546 B.C.E.), Herodotus establishes patterns in his work. He offers alternative accounts of the abductions of women from the ancient world: Io, Europa, Medea, and Helen, in order to say that he does not know

which account is true although he says that there are those who do believe that these abductions are the reasons why the Greeks and Persians are in conflict (Hdt. 1.2-5).

To provide a valid reason for his history that counteracts the abduction accounts he names a factual man, Croesus of Lydia (Hdt. 1.6-29). He proceeds to tell how Croesus was the first to do wrongs to the Greeks, which eventually bring forth the subsequent clashes between the Asian mainland and the Greek mainland. As a non-Greek monarch Croesus subdues and demands tribute from the Greeks in Ionia. At this point, Herodotus offers an account of why the Ionian Greeks were free (*eleutheroi*) before Croesus conquers them (1.6.3). In ancient times the Ionians arrive from the free Greek mainland as colonists and settle – building cities and thriving. The Ionians are free until Croesus reigns in Lydia (560-547/6). Croesus rules Ionia until 547/6 B.C.E. when Cyrus, the first king of Persia (557-530 B.C.E.), after defeating Astyages king of the Medes, overcomes Croesus in battle (1.95-216). While Cyrus is king of Persia he expands his military campaigns to other regions of the Asian mainland; in the end, the Massagetae kill him in 530 B.C.E. when he attempts to expand his empire eastward (1.214).

In book two, following the king's death, his son Cambyses (530-522 B.C.E.) moves into Egypt with military campaigns (Hdt. 2.1). But before relating Cambyses' invasion of Egypt, Herodotus details Egyptian history and customs from 3000 B.C.E. For the purpose of this paper, two Egyptian kings are worthy of mention, Sesostris and Amasis (570-552 B.C.E.), plus the tale of Rhodopis (2.102-110, 2.172-182). Both narratives of the kings offer significant views on Herodotus' approach to the concept of freedom and to monarchical political systems. The account of Sesostris' victories illustrates the action a people take to win or not to win freedom.⁴⁴ In this particular case, Herodotus says that he is an eyewitness to the pillars Sesostris erects after his victories (2.106.1). One of the reasons Herodotus includes the Amasis story is to show his even-handedness towards political systems. In this case the political system that he

⁴⁴ This is one of the patterns Herodotus uses to show his views on how a city or a state wins or loses freedom – either hard work or no resistance. Sesostris' is a legendary king from the Twelfth Dynasty. The great conquests ascribed to him in Africa and Asia are based on several rulers (*OCD*, 1306).

describes is Amasis' monarchy. In addition to the monarchical system, he tells of the accomplishments and the way an individual, the woman Rhodopis, uses her freedom (2.134-135). These stories offer an opportunity for Herodotus to partially fulfill his purpose to show the wondrous deeds of non-Greeks. The stories also provide a means to return to the narrative of Persia.

Book three begins by offering several reasons why Cambyses decides to attack Egypt (Hdt. 3.1-38).⁴⁵ It goes on to cover three areas. The first is Cambyses' conquest of Egypt in 522 B.C.E.; the second is an illustration of Cambyses' attitude and actions in Northern Africa; the third returns to ensure that the reader continues to be aware of Persia's presence in the whole scheme of events. At this point, it is time to pull in the Greek mainland with the account of why Sparta attacks Samos in 522 B.C.E., an island near Miletus just off the coast of the Asian mainland (3.39-60).

The following significant events, also in book three, occur on the Asian mainland in the Persian capital of Susa. Through trickery, The Magi⁴⁶ revolt against Cambyses. Smerdes, a Magus, reigns, but seven Persian nobles conspire to kill Smerdes, and so Darius, son of Hystapes, takes the Persian throne (522-521 B.C.E., 3.61-87). Darius rules 521-486 B.C.E. However, for the purpose of this work on freedom, the Constitutional Debate among the three nobles, Otanes, Megabyzus, and Darius, is an important highlight (3.80-88). Herodotus seems to refrain deliberately from including the word "freedom" in the Debate, but nearly everything that the nobles say describes characteristics of democratic freedom in a roundabout fashion. The three nobles debate the pros and cons of three political systems: democracy, oligarchy, and monarchy. Monarchy wins out, and Darius becomes king.

Book four maps out the 513 B.C.E. campaigns of King Darius' reign (Hdt. 4.1-144). Darius sets out on an expedition to Scythia north of the Black Sea in order to

⁴⁵ This is one of the examples of Herodotus' style of writing and patterns. He offers different versions of stories to explain why Cambyses attacks Egypt. The exercise reflects the democratic method of making a decision; Herodotus does not offer a true version of his own view, rather he leaves it to the reader. As a consequence it draws the reader in as a participant in the events and supports his comment that he reports what he hears.

⁴⁶ The Magi (Magus) are one of the Mede tribes.

enslave the Scythians, a free non-Greek nation (4.110.2). One of Herodotus' key focuses with regard to the expedition is a discussion on the Ister Bridge between the Scythians and the Ionians whom Darius has appointed as tyrants over the Ionian cities (4.136-140). The topic of the discussion is freedom versus tyranny. Tyranny wins,⁴⁷ and consequently the Ionians do not destroy the bridge so that the Persians cross back safely into their own territory. The next expedition Darius makes is to Libya (4.145-205 (4.145-205). The Persian army, at the behest of the Egyptian Aryandes, conquers the city of Barco in Lybia; as booty the Persians enslave the Barcaeans (4.200.1, 203.1).

Book five continues King Darius' campaigns as he moves over the Hellespont and on into Europe (Hdt. 5.1-29). The Persians under Megabyzus conquer the Perinthians and the Paionians. Moving farther across the northern Aegean mainland, Darius' forces subdue Thrace, and then Macedon (5.3-21). While Persia mainly focuses her interest on Greece, the Ionian cities begin to revolt against Persia with Aristagoras, the tyrant of Miletus, as the leading figure (5.30-61). Aristagoras approaches Cleomenes, king of Sparta, for help in freeing Ionia from Persia, but Cleomenes refuses Aristagoras' request. Since the Spartans refuse, Herodotus follows Aristagoras over to Athens, a city that is now free (5.62-97). With Spartan help, Athens has recently freed herself from the tyrant Hippias and now democratically votes to send twenty ships to Ionia to help Aristagoras in his revolt. Nevertheless, in 497-495 B.C.E. Persia reconquers Ionia.

In book six the Persians recoup their losses in Ionia and establish a restless peace (Hdt. 6.1-45). Having been betrayed by the tyrants, Mardonius, the Persian general and regional commander, sets up democracies in the Ionian cities (6.42-48). The Persians extend their power on the Greek mainland and islands with requests for earth and water (6.50-93). Aegina, an island off the coast of Attica, gives earth and water, which unsettles the Athenians (6.49). In this same time rifts in the city of Sparta occur: the city deposes King Demaratus, and Leutychides replaces Demaratus as king to rule alongside Cleomenes (6.67.1-2). While factions fester on the Greek mainland,

⁴⁷ Herodotus uses the term democracy (*demokratie*) for the first time in his *Histories* during the bridge discussion.

Darius in Susa commands his servant to remind him constantly to “remember the Athenians” because they had sent aid to the Ionian revolt. He is determined to subdue all Greeks who refuse to give him earth and water (6.94.1-2). With this reminder and the refusal of some of the Greeks to accept Darius’ sovereignty, Darius organizes the Marathon campaign in order to invade Greece (6.94.1-2). Hippias, the deposed Athenian tyrant, guides Darius’ army into Greece, but the Athenians defeat the Persians in 490 B.C.E. (6.109-115).

Book seven relates how Darius organizes a second army against Greece, but then dies (Hdt.7.1-7). Xerxes, his son, takes over the preparations to march into Greece (480 B.C.E., 7.8-177). Two significant dialogues occur with Xerxes on the feasibility of carrying on with the planned invasion. The first conversation takes place with his uncle Artabanus, and the second is with Demaratus, the exiled king of Sparta (7.46-53, 101-105). In spite of Artabanus’ and Demaratus’ advice against the invasion, the invading armies march forth. The Persians are victorious in the Thermopylae battle, where Leonidas, the king of Sparta who succeeded Cleomenes, dies (7.178-238).

As book eight begins, the naval battles off Artemisium between the Greek fleet and the Persian fleet take place in 480 B.C.E.; at the same time, the Persian land army meets the Spartans in battle at Thermopylae (Hdt. 8.1-26). Later in book eight, but also in 480 B.C.E., the naval battle of Salamis occurs (8.40-96). With planning and guile, the Athenian Themistocles persuades the Greeks to stay and fight, and finally they defeat the Persians in the definitive naval battle at Salamis (8.75-90). Xerxes and his fleet sail back to the Asian mainland leaving Mardonius in command of subsequent land battles (8.107). As Mardonius plans the next battle, he sends King Alexander, of the enslaved state of Macedonia, to the Greeks to propose to them an agreement with the Persians (8.130-140). The result of the agreement would have been that Persia had sovereign power over all Greece. The Athenians reply famously that they will never abandon the cause of freedom for Greece so long as they live (8.143-144).

Mardonius in book nine offers Athens special treatment in renewed proposal, which the Athenians ignore. As a result the Persian forces burn Athens and Mardonius forms plans to engage in battle at Plataea (Hdt. 9.1-24). The Battle of Plataea takes

place in 479 B.C.E. (9.15-83). Skirmishes occur; Pausanias, the Spartan general, calls on the Athenians for a united front; but the Boeotians, allies of Persia, attack and detain the major part of the Athenian army (9.6-61). In the final stage of the battle the Tegeans and the Spartans kill Mardonius and defeat the Persians (9.61-75). In the same year at Mycale, off the coast of Asia Minor, the last battle, at sea, occurs between the Greeks and the Persians in Herodotus' *Histories* (9.102-107). The Greeks defeat the Persians. Herodotus ends his account of the conflicts between Greece and Persia with the sage advice of Cyrus the Great. Cyrus appears to tell the Persians that if they continue their expansions they will no longer be rulers in their own land, but they will become slaves. Cyrus says that too much wealth, land, and power breed soft men; good, strong, and valiant men rise from the soil that demands hard work, an independent spirit, and perseverance from each individual. Cyrus thus summarizes the views that Herodotus holds in order for states to win freedom and equality (9.122.3-4).

2.1. Freedom as *Leitmotiv*

In Herodotus' view, the figure of Cyrus the man and king, and Athens with its democratic autonomous political system, are comparable entities. They represent the individual and the city to show what it means to be free. Ten top events in Herodotus illustrate how I see the concept of freedom playing a role in the *Histories*. Ten of the anecdotes from the above section in the nine books highlight how the operations of freedom move forward to democratic freedom.

Herodotus begins with the freedom of the individual who is Cyrus, most appropriately – a non-Greek, but he is free in the eyes of the classical world because of his birth (Hdt. 1.115.1-3, 116.1). From a democratic point of view, it is the individual who is equal, the basic denominator in a free society. Herodotus also concerns himself with the way Rhodopis uses her freedom to better herself financially and to pay homage to the gods (2.134-135). Book three offers two top events: the Persian Constitutional Debate and Darius' acquisition of the Persian crown (3.80-83, 88-160). Book four supplies the Bridge discussion in Scythia: the Bridge decision shows why the Ionians, despite being Greek, reject democratic freedom. Book five describes how Athens rids itself of the tyrant Hippias to gain freedom (5.64.2, 65.5, 66. 1-2). Book six gives an

account of Darius' Marathon expedition into Greece (6.94-120). Books seven, eight, and nine narrate the battle stories of Thermopylae (where 300 Spartans die for freedom), and Salamis, Plataea, and Mycale – all victories for the Greeks (7.238, 8.99.2, 100.1, 9.60-64.1, 90. 96-101).

From Cyrus to the final battles, the concept of freedom and its accompanying characteristics in political systems act as a motif in each major event. Herodotus primarily uses a measured tone as he offers anecdotes and episodes to show the role that freedom plays. He is non-judgmental whether or not freedom is accepted or not accepted; he simply brings to the attention of his audience the results of his research on the deeds of Greeks and non-Greeks.

Herodotus embarks on his journey with the freedom motif in connection with non-Greeks to show how an individual inherits and develops a natural freedom as part of his person (Hdt. 95-216). The individual is Cyrus, the first king of Persia. Cyrus is also partly Mede, and the Medes are said to have cast off their slavery from the Assyrians to win freedom in 709 B.C.E.:

After the Assyrians had ruled Upper Asia for five hundred and twenty years, the Medes were the first who began to revolt from them. These, it would seem, proved their bravery in fighting for freedom against the Assyrians; they cast off their slavery and won freedom. Afterwards, the other subject nations, too, did the same as the Medes. (1.95.2)

The traditional story of the victory is part of Mede history and some would say that the conquest over the Assyrians that brings freedom would be in the consciousness of many following generations. Note how Herodotus connects the struggle for freedom with proof that the Medes are “brave men” (ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί).

Freedom is in Cyrus' blood even though a slave brings him up. Cyrus is the grandson of Astyages king of the Medes (1.116).⁴⁸ Cyrus' mother is the daughter of Astyages; his father is a high-born Persian (1.107-108). In the classical period the descendent of a king and a nobleman automatically inherits the freedom of a nobleman in Persia. The combination of the historical victory and the inheritance from his parents brings us to the scene where Astyages recognizes Cyrus as his grandson.

In direct speech Cyrus tells the king, unbeknownst to him that the king is his grandfather, that the other boys had chosen him to be their "king", which is why he had punished one of his playmates, who was otherwise from a nobler background, but that he is accountable for his own actions (1.115.3).

While the boy spoke, it seemed to Astyages that he recognized him; the character of his face was like his own, he thought, and his manner of answering was rather free. (116.1)

The role that freedom plays in the two accounts – the Mede victory and the Cyrus and Astyages meeting, brings up three issues. One is that the Medes win freedom from the Assyrians. The Medes live in a partially wooded and mountainous area (1.110.1-2). One of Herodotus' points is that those who win freedom live in a hard land without luxury. The second point is that Herodotus' views coincide with classical assumption of inheritance of character traits as well as looks. Thirdly, in these two pieces of information a united people, the Medes, win freedom and an individual, in this case Cyrus, represents the notion that a free person is solely responsible for his actions. Thus, although two hundred years separate the Medes' victory and the arrival of Cyrus, Herodotus shows that the role of freedom in conjunction with a hard life, a united group, and an individual who is accountable for his actions brings success and victory.

⁴⁸ How and Wells say that historically it is questionable whether Cyrus is the grandson of Astyages. Astyages is a descendant of Deioces who because of craftiness and the desire for absolute rule takes the freedom from the Medes, which they had won from the Assyrians (1.96-99.101, 107). To be impartial as Herodotus is, it is necessary to recognize that the Medes themselves are partially responsible for their loss of freedom. They prefer to tend to their own business rather than to involve themselves in the affairs of the state. One could say, to use a battle phrase, they offered no resistance.

In a similar vein freedom plays a role in the Persian victory over the Medes (Hdt.1.125-126). Cyrus, the individual and leader of the Persians, persuades the Persians to choose victory and freedom over the tyranny of the Medes (Herodotus offers the account of how Cyrus makes the Persians receptive to fighting the Medes. Astyages has dealt harshly with the Persians causing discontent (1.123-127.1).⁴⁹ Cyrus tells the Persians to work hard clearing a thorny patch the next day, but the day following the hard work they arrive dressed in their best to enjoy a sumptuous feast. When the meal is over Cyrus asks which day is the Persians' preference, the day of hard work or the day of luxurious dining. In direct speech he tells them, "do as I tell you, and win your freedom;" if not they will have "toil and slavery" (1.126.5-6). When there is a choice between freedom or slavery, Herodotus places the choice in direct speech in order to emphasize the importance of the decision.

The similarities to the Medes' victory over the Assyrians are that the Persians live in a harsh land as did the Medes (Hdt. 1.126.1, 110.1-2). Secondly, they are united in purpose, as were the Medes. But it is in the following issues that the similarities fall apart. Yes, Cyrus is an individual who is accountable for his actions; therefore he is autonomous and if the revolt fails, he takes the consequences as leader (1.115.3). Freedom still plays a deciding role in the venture, but two features are outstandingly different. The Persians rebel to have freedom, but also to acquire a life of luxury; freedom is not the exclusive purpose of the revolt. Further, with freedom, the Persians gain freedom from the Medes, but must obey Cyrus. However, they are united in their desire for freedom from the Medes and this brings success and victory. One may surmise that Herodotus has Cyrus aware of the fact that the Persians are more inclined toward a softer life than towards simply a state of freedom.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ True, vengeance is a part of the story – Harpagas connives to persuade the Persians to choose Cyrus as their leader because of his own personal animosity over what Astyages has done to his own child (1.123.1). Many scholars cite vengeance as a strong motif concerning the story of the clashes between the East and the West. Vengeance is a factor in many cases, but it is a static state and does not move forward like the freedom motif does.

⁵⁰ This topic is a matter for debate – another topic. Is that human nature? I sense, that Cyrus' plan is to use guile to achieve victory. The use of guile is another of the patterns that Herodotus recognizes.

Herodotus approaches the Egyptian King Sesostris and the Rhodopis anecdotes with the same even-handedness as the Medes and the Persians (Hdt. 2.102-110, 134-135). There are differences in the role of the freedom motif as well as in the focal points of the Egyptian narratives compared to the accounts on the Medes and the Persians. Like Cyrus, Sesostris is autonomous as an individual and as a king (2.102.1). When Sesostris subdues men and the cities sets up pillars, which Herodotus says he has seen; to show emphasis that the pillars exist, Herodotus uses the first person personal pronoun (1.106.1-4). Sesostris overpowers the cities; herein is the difference from most of other victories that Herodotus relates. After the Egyptian victories, Sesostris sets up pillars both for those who fought hard for freedom and for those who offered no resistance:

When those that he met were valiant men and strove hard for freedom, he set up pillars in their land, the inscription on which showed his own name and his country's, and how he had overcome them with his own power; but when the cities had made no resistance and been easily taken, then he put an inscription on the pillars just as he had done where the nations were brave; but he also drew on them the private parts of a woman, wishing to show clearly that the people were feeble (ἀνάλκιδες). (2.102.4-5)

In other words, Sesostris (as well as Herodotus) admires those who fight bravely for freedom and reasons that those who give it up are to be associated with the weaker sex. The brave men deserve admiration even though Sesostris defeats them, but the other group, although they are still members of the human race—they receive the same inscription on their pillars—do not receive his respect. Herodotus does not make a comment on which parties win his approval, but by the very nature of his including the anecdote and by his saying that he has seen the pillars, the inscriptions, the designs, and that he has personally seen them, the report conveys his views more vividly than any sentence that says whether he approves.

In the King Sesostris case freedom is the prize, but the men and cities do not achieve freedom. What is important to Herodotus is that the brave men who fight hard are worthy of admiration. In the case of the Rhodopis episode (who is an individual woman), she uses her freedom for notable achievements (Hdt. 2.134-135). Charaxus manumits Rhodopis, a Thracian slave; she then employs her freedom to bring success

and a tenth of her wealth as an offering to dedicate to the temple in Delphi (2.135.5). Herodotus points out that the meanings of freedom still contain success. The men are successful – each for himself, yet they fight as a unit. Rhodopis' success is a private one. Before she becomes a free person she works as a slave and is not a private person, but when she is free she is a private person and volunteers to share her wealth with the gods. When one shares with the gods, it aids in instilling harmony and unity within a community. Freedom has a role in these stories. Each event describes a success, but the meanings and the way to success follow different paths.

In the Constitutional Debate, three Persian noblemen propose the type of political system he thinks best suits Persia (Hdt. 3.80-83). The different proposals offer various types of freedom. As is the custom with Herodotus, he refrains from marked approval or disapproval on any of the forms of government. The number of lines he gives to each interlocutor seems an indicator of the importance he attaches to the offered system. Altogether he gives Otanes sixty-one lines, Megabyzus nineteen and a half lines, and Darius thirty-eight lines.⁵¹ Otanes begins and ends the Debate, which suggests that Herodotus considers his proposal, for popular rule, where each individual decides for himself, that is, where each has equality (*isonomien*), to be the most appropriate for human potential (8.80.6, 83.1). Megabyzus, arguing for oligarchy, receives the least amount of space and time, but Darius' speech length is closer to Otanes'. In each case Herodotus carefully brings forth reasons to condemn a proposal while offering the positive features as well. Megabyzus and Darius condemn popular government because it is a system dominated by a useless and foolish mob; Darius condemns oligarchies because factions and bloodshed develop, which often lead to violent clashes. Both Otanes and Megabyzus condemn autocracy because there is no control on the one man who rules (3.80.3-4, 81.1, 82.1-2).

Four out of the seven men assembled vote for monarchy. Ironically, freedom is the key to its success. Darius reminds the debaters that Cyrus brought freedom to the Persians:

⁵¹ My line numbers differ from Lateiner's numbered lines (199). I view the amount of time and space allotted to each person's proposal is as important as the succinct stated argument.

where did freedom come from for us and who gave it, from the people or an oligarchy or a single ruler? I believe, therefore, that we who were liberated through one man should maintain such a government (Hdt. 3.82.5).

To jump back to Egypt: Herodotus says that the Egyptians themselves desire a monarchy; they say they cannot live without a king (2.147.2). This is another indication of Herodotus' ambivalent approach towards systems of government and the varying types of freedom. What is important is that there is action and unity within a city or an empire. If the number of lines appropriated for each interlocutor is an indication of Herodotus' leanings towards popular government and a monarchy with popular government in his mind winning out, there is a catch. Along with the Debate Herodotus does not neglect to tell the tale of the trickery of Darius' groom, which leads to his being chosen the new monarch (3.85-88). This is another one of Herodotus' patterns of guile or trickery that brings victory, though in this case Herodotus adds that thunder and lightning confirmed the choice (3.86.2).

So far the freedom motif has not moved forward beyond the Mede and Persian victories or beyond the way that Rhodopis usefully employs her freedom with the accounts moving towards the success mode. However, the Persian Constitutional Debate brings out into the open the concept of popular government in Otanes' speeches; it suggests that the system is "floating in the air". The episode of no resistance with Sesostris shows how he expresses his disapproval of those who are unwilling to fight for freedom. The selection of monarchy in the Debate enables Herodotus to unveil his personal preference for popular government. In spite of the well-scripted condemnation of a people's political system, with the simple act in the Debate that the majority rules, he has the Persian noblemen demonstrate one of the characteristics of popular government. Herodotus illustrates his approval of an act either by saying that he sees something and he reports it, in this case the pillar episode, or with the Debate, he describes the drama. In either case, though he does not come out openly with the comment that he approves – he has yet to say explicitly that he is himself in favour of freedom – he shows that he approves of hard work in fighting for freedom. For success in the endeavour, and in the Debate he establishes one of the features of a self-governed political system as a decision-maker. In spite of the act of voting and of Otanes' speeches, the freedom motif still has a rocky road ahead.

The Samos episode is straightforward and without the ambiguity of the Debate. Both Oroetes of Magnesia and Maeandrius offer freedom and equality to the Samians after the death of the ambitious tyrant Polycrates (3.125.3, 142.4-5). The episode with Oroetes shows how assassination is one of the ways a tyrant loses power: desiring to enrich and empower himself, Polycrates visits Oroetes in Magnesia and is deceitfully murdered by him (3.122-125). The story gives expression to Herodotus' view of tyranny, that tyrants are motivated by greed. Oroetes' method of killing Polycrates, according to Herodotus, is too terrible to tell, and Maeandrius, who succeeds as tyrant of Samos, is untrustworthy.

After offering to give up power and establish equality (ἰσονομίην), withholding only some of Polycrates' money and the priesthood of Zeus the Liberator for himself, Maeandrius encounters aristocratic scepticism and so takes security on the acropolis. He then calls in each Samian, presumably just the aristocrats, and imprisons them. When he then falls sick, his brother Lycaretus takes over and slaughters the prisoners. Herodotus concludes the story by saying of the prisoners: "They had, it would seem, no desire to be free" (3.143.2). According to Herodotus a tyrant is untrustworthy and corrupt, and the Samian aristocrats' jealousy overcame any desire for freedom.⁵² The stark assessment indicates Herodotus' view that another aspect to winning freedom besides fighting hard and using freedom appropriately is simply to desire freedom for oneself and others as a high priority.

For the role that freedom plays, book four offers a semi-climax in the text. Freedom arrives at the crossroads to meet with the Greeks. In every circumstance where freedom is a part of Herodotus' narrative, it is the Medes, the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Samians that express how freedom loses or wins in battle or the way one puts freedom to use, or freedom loses its opportunity through a lack of desire. Skilfully Herodotus brings the Scythians into the story when he has the Amazons land in the country of the "free Scythians" (4.110.2). With the Scythians, Herodotus opens and expands the freedom motif into Greece via the bridge at the Ister River (4.136-137, 139, 142).

⁵² How and Wells 1.299 cite the actions of a corrupt tyrant in 7.164.

The Ionians hold the bridge over the Ister (the Danube) for Darius as he invades Scythia. The Scythians say freedom will come to the Ionians if they destroy the bridge (Hdt. 4.136.4). The broken bridge will prevent Darius from returning to his homeland and the Scythians will destroy Persian forces. The Ionians and Miltiades, who even as an Athenian is a Greek ruler of an Ionian city, hold a council. It is Miltiades the Athenian who proposes that the Ionians follow the Scythians' advice to take the advantage and to gain their freedom from the king. This is the first time a Greek from the mainland says the word "freedom". Histiaeus, the Persian-supported tyrant of Miletus, is the figure Herodotus selects to say the word "democracy" (*demokratia*):

It is owing to Darius that each of us is tyrant of his city; if Darius' power is overthrown, we shall no longer be able to rule, I in Miletus or any of you elsewhere; for all the cities will choose democracy rather than tyranny. (4.137.1-2)⁵³

Herodotus clearly believes that it is the responsibility of each group to do for itself what it takes to acquire democratic freedom – to be accountable for their own actions, as Cyrus as a boy shows in his meeting with Astyages (1.116). The Ionian tyrants vote to turn down the opportunity for freedom as the reader has seen happen in the Sesostris, Samian, and Persian Debate narratives (2.102, 3.83.1, 3.143.2). For them, "freedom" means "democracy" and an end to their power.

Another obstacle to the movement forward in the freedom motif occurs when Megabyzus and his Persian forces overcome the Perinthians north of the Black Sea as Persia moves into Europe. Herodotus, as he is wont to do and say with valiant men who fight against King Sesostris, he makes certain that the reader knows that the Perinthians "fought" like brave men for their freedom" (5.2; cf. 2.102.4). To fight bravely for freedom is one of the cornerstones embedded into the channels to gain freedom, even though in these two episodes (the Sesostris tale and the Perinthians) neither party wins.

⁵³ Herodotus lists the tyrants in 4.138: "Daphnis of Abydos, Hippoclus of Lampsacus, Herophantus of Parium, Metrodorus of Proconnesus, Aristagoras of Cyzicus, Ariston of Byzantium, all from the Hellespont and tyrants of cities there; and from Ionia, Strattis of Chios, Aiaces of Samos, Laodamas of Phocaea, and Histiaeus of Miletus."

In Herodotus' narrative, the Persians and others lay the foundations leading the way through forward steps and obstacles. The idea of freedom makes use of Persian foundations and continues to move towards the pinnacle of freedom – democratic freedom. Book five is the heart of the forward movement with the freedom motif. Herodotus illustrates this with his demonstration of thirteen words of freedom – the highest total of freedom words in any of his books. One speaks of the pinnacle of freedom with caution; bear in mind that in the Constitutional Debate, Herodotus makes certain that the audience is aware of the pitfalls that Megabyzus and Darius address in a democratic political system (Hdt. 3.81-82). The source of danger in the climb of the freedom motif occurs in Athens.

Freedom crosses the bridge from Greece; it has already taken root in Athens after the Pisistratid tyrants lose control. The Pisistratids are tyrants in Athens for thirty-six years, 545-509 B.C.E after Peisistratus finally consolidates his power. After Hipparchus, one of the sons of Peisistratus, is killed, his brother Hippias rules as tyrant alone. At that point the Alcmeonids return to Athenian territory and establish themselves at Lipsydrium, on the slope of Mount Parnes, and at Delphi, where they rebuilt the temple and influenced the oracle. Under that influence, the Spartans helped to drive Hippias out and “set Athens free” (5.63). After the Athenians are “freed” of the Pisistratid tyrants there are still factions of contention between Cleisthenes, an Alcmaeonid, and Isagoras son of Tisandrius (Hdt. 5.62.1-2, 64.2, 65, 66.1).

Another cornerstone in a fight for freedom is a united front. The Cyprians and the Ionians face the Phoenicians and Persians; the Cyprians wisely tell the Ionians to form a united strategic plan with them to ward off their enemies (Hdt. 5.109.2). According to the Cyprians, Ionians have the responsibility to decide whether or not the Cyprians and Ionians will be free men or slaves. The Ionians refuse to follow the Cyprians advice so once again the Cyprians are slaves after a year of freedom; the Ionians remain slaves. To fight bravely does not always lead to freedom, but to refuse to work together as a unit, in Herodotus' eyes, is a certain way to lose a battle for freedom.

After these episodes of failure, Herodotus provides the upbeat story of how Athens wins freedom and moves into a democratic system of government (Hdt. 5.62-65).

In four lines Herodotus uses the first personal pronoun twice and further says, “I shall tell how the Athenians become free,” in order to secure the attention of the audience (5.62.1). Herodotus starts off with the bribing of the Pythian priestess. She is to tell all Spartans who come to Delphi to set Athens free (5.63.1-2). This is the pattern that uses guile to achieve a goal; Herodotus tells it without approval or disapproval. He simply reports what he has heard (5.63.1). Then he carries on with his story of how the Spartans and the Athenians drive the Pisistratids out of Athens (5.49.2-3). Now that Athens is free and autonomous, Aristagoras arrives in the city to ask for help in freeing the Ionians from the Persians. First he goes to Sparta to ask for aid from Cleomenes (5.49.2-3). The king refuses the request; Aristagoras arrives in Athens and persuades the Athenians to send twenty ships (5.1.3, 5.5.1, 6.5.5, 97.2-3). It is at this point, that Herodotus has a little laugh at the Athenians with a poke at them in the way they first use their democratic freedom. Herodotus says that it is easier to convince thirty thousand/twenty thousand Athenians than to convince one man – Cleomenes (5.97.2). However, Herodotus returns to seriousness and the freedom motif to show how democratic freedom serves the best interests of the individual and the city.

Now that Athens has autonomous democratic freedom, success in battle becomes a vibrant pattern (Hdt.5.66.1, 78). Herodotus is adamant when he says that although Athens had been great before her freedom she is now greater than ever. Not only does Herodotus state that with freedom each individual achieves and is accountable for himself – see shades of Cyrus in the Astyages meeting, but Herodotus allows himself the latitude to say unequivocally that equality (*isonomie*) is a worthwhile thing (*spoudaion chrêma* 1.116).

Evidence for this is the fact that while they were under tyrannical rulers, the Athenians were no better in war than any of their neighbours, yet once they got rid of their tyrants, they were by far the best of all. This, then, shows that while they were oppressed, they were, as men working for a master, cowardly, but when they were freed, each one was eager to achieve for himself. (5.78; cf. 5.91)

To use the adjective, “worthwhile” (*spoudaion* as opposed to *ponêron*) means that men who have equality are morally of good character, serious, earnest, and zealous. Herodotus reaches the height of his partisan support for freedom and autonomous democracy when he says that equality is good. At the same time he takes the reader

back to the importance of the individual who accepts responsibility for himself. He implies that this is a basic assumption that should be in a political system. To pin down the magnitude of this stage in the role that freedom plays and to show that each individual is accountable and equal in the eyes of all Athenians, Herodotus now says that the Athenians are not only better than their neighbours in war, “but first of all” (5.78). What more adulation is Herodotus able to heap upon Athens and its autonomous political system to its citizens?

The growing power of democratic Athens frightens Sparta. She calls upon her allies to support the restoration of the Pisistratid Hippias, the last tyrant of Athens (Hdt. 5.92). Socles the Corinthian tells the Spartans that they are destroying the rule of equals; he tells the tale of tyrannical abuse in Corinth and finishes off with the statement that the Corinthians will not join in restoring tyrannical rule (5.92.4e). What is interesting is that Herodotus uses the adverb “freely” (ἐλευθέρως) in Socles’ speech (5.923.2). Forsdyke says that under tyranny a person may sometimes speak freely; in a democratic system free speech is called *isegoria*.⁵⁴

The growing power of Athens that Sparta fears causes Herodotus to dwell more fully on Athens and her hatred of tyranny. Herodotus says explicitly that in his judgment the Alcmeonidae, who initiate the process of freeing Athens, are responsible for Athens’ freedom on account of their Pythian bribery (6.123). What does one make of that comment? Does Herodotus mean that if bribery achieves its aim, that it is good? What he emphasizes in that comment is that the Alcmeonidae hate tyranny as much as Callias.⁵⁵

In book six Athens exercises her hatred of tyranny and makes use of her triumphal freedom before the battle of Marathon (490 B.C.E.). Herodotus demonstrates the democratic method of making a decision just before the battle that could bring on

⁵⁴ Since Herodotus has Socles speak freely in Sparta, does that suggest that Sparta has features of tyranny in its governmental system?

⁵⁵ It is interesting that while speaking of cities that absented themselves from the war (8.73.3), Herodotus says, “If I may speak freely” (*eleutherōs*). This suggests that Herodotus may feel some type of constraint. Would the constraint come from the cities that did not join in with the rest of the Greeks? From whom would he garner disapproval?

tyranny again. The generals must decide whether to fight immediately or to wait for their allies to arrive (6.109.3). Miltiades urges the Polemarch Callimachus to side in favour of an immediate fight:

Callimachus, it is now in your hands to enslave Athens or make her free, and thereby leave behind for all posterity a memorial such as not even Harmodius and Aristogeiton left. (6.109.3)

Freedom plays its role out fully when the generals decide to fight after Callimachus casts the deciding vote in favour of engaging in battle immediately. With this decision, Herodotus draws a contrast between the Athenians and the Persians in the Debate, who vote four out of seven for a monarchy, and the Ionians at the bridge in Scythia, who vote against freedom and democracy (Hdt. 3.83, 4.137).⁵⁶

However, Herodotus also shows that there are Ionians who choose freedom over tyranny (6.5.1). Once Miletus in Ionia is rid of Aristagoras, the city makes certain that another tyrant, Histiaeus, does not return as a replacement. At the same time though, when Dionysius, the Phocaeen general, offers the Ionians at Lade the choice of freedom or slavery, they choose slavery. Dionysius insists on rigorous training for the Ionian fleet and offers them freedom and hard work or slothfulness and slavery:

Our affairs, men of Ionia, stand on the edge of a razor, whether to be free men or slaves, and runaway slaves at that. If you now consent to endure hardships, you will have toil for the present time, but it will be in your power to overcome your enemies and gain freedom (6.11-12).

An important point in these two episodes is that like the Athenians the Ionians have the opportunity to make a decision regarding freedom or slavery. In one case, in Herodotus' view, the Milesians choose the right decision; the other case illustrates the wrong decision in the pattern of not following the advisor. Decisions are the bedrock of what type of political system develops in a state.

Xerxes, now king of Persia, plans to subdue the Greeks (Hdt. 7.2-3). Both Artabanus and Demaratus advise against the invasion, but Xerxes is neither impressed

⁵⁶ Of course no one remembers Callimachus. Miltiades gets the credit.

with nor influenced by their advice (7.46.1, 103.5, 104.4). Xerxes believes in the military superiority of authoritarian rule over freedom:

If they were under the rule of one man according to our custom, they might out of fear of him become better than they naturally are, and under compulsion of the lash they might go against greater numbers of inferior men; but if they are allowed to go free they would do neither. (7.103.4)

Xerxes is also supremely confident in his forces, allowing Greek spies to be released; he says that when the Greeks hear of his planned expansion, they will surrender their "individual freedom". It will then be unnecessary to march against them (Hdt. 7.147.1). This "strange freedom" that Xerxes mentions is borne out in the interview the Spartans Sperthias and Bulis, have with Hydarnes (7.135.3). They tell Hydarnes that once he tastes freedom nothing will prevent his fighting for it. The contrasting comments of Xerxes and the Spartan young men designate the differences between the Greek autonomous freedom and the Persian enslaved freedom. Neither Hydarnes nor Xerxes have a conception of the kind of freedom the Greeks experience. It is at this point that the role of freedom takes on two shades of meaning. The Persians consider themselves free; their king is free and independent, but the subjects are slaves. Greek freedom means all men are free, equal, and autonomous. In order to gain or maintain this Greek "strange freedom," a state must be united and agree to follow freely its chosen leader without force.

As Persia invades Greece, the Athenians do not panic or leave the country. Rather, they lead the Greeks in a united and orderly front - even calling in allies from Sicily (Hdt. 7.139.5, 178.2, 157.2). True, Greek freedom has a set-back when the Spartans lose to Xerxes' force at Thermopylae, but that is attributed to the departure of allies and not to their own lack of bravery (7.207, 221-225). The role freedom plays is such a precious commodity, that to die for freedom as the Spartans do, in the eyes of the Greeks, is to die the most heroic of deaths. Greek freedom requires no whips (7.223.3).

The Alexander, Spartan, and Athenian dialogues illustrate that force and violence do not drive the Greeks to fight for their freedom (Hdt. 8. 140.4a, 142.3, 143.1). The Persian general Mardonius' envoy, Alexander of Macedon, offers bribes of more

territory, the rebuilding of temples, and forgiveness to the Athenians; the Athenians may even keep their own kind of freedom (8.140.1-4). The Athenians simply say “no.” They will fight to their end - paying tribute to the Spartans at Thermopylae (8.149.1-4, 143.1-3). To show the importance of giving one’s life for freedom, Herodotus includes the oracle that says “Victory” will come and freedom will “dawn upon Hellas” (8.77.2).

Freedom and victory come to Greece in spite of Mardonius’ Persian council in Thebes. The council has a decision to make: shall they fight immediately, or offer bribes and favours to the Greek leaders? Since immediate battle is chosen, and fails, Herodotus seems to suggest that the Greek leaders might have been susceptible to bribery if the Persians had chosen that route (9.41.3).

The Greeks are victorious at Salamis, Artemisium, Plataea and Mycale (Hdt. 7. 166, 9.45.2-3, 98.3). This paragraph displays two patterns that Herodotus uses in his employment of the freedom motif and the role it plays. One pattern is that once Athens becomes autonomous and free, she wins her battles. The other pattern is that when the wise advisor is ignored, disaster follows. Xerxes had his chance after his dialogues with Artabanus and Demaratus to make the right decision, to save lives, and to avoid humiliation.

In conclusion, the freedom motif shows in its role that factors such as individual accountability, united fronts, and a willingness to work hard and fight for freedom in nearly every case, brings freedom. Once Athens gains democratic autonomy, freedom, she never loses a battle. On the other hand, to offer no resistance, to be forced to fight, and/or to be in a state of disunion, are strategies for a calamitous ending.

Chapter 3.

Herodotus: The Political Freedom Circuit

There are still several critical issues to examine in Herodotus' approach to freedom. How and why do ethnic groups work or not work freedom in their societies. What is the relationship of political freedom to the varying regional parts of Herodotus' world and their geographical characteristics? Does Herodotus view the Greeks (but not the non-Greeks) as naturally free? What does he consider to be the basis of a free society? How and why does he present this view?

Herodotus approaches his *Histories* with the following purposes in mind: he does not want the deeds of Greeks and non-Greeks to be forgotten. Secondly, he wants to show why there have been conflicts between groups and especially why the Greeks and Persians fought in the great contest that involves the east and the west (Hdt. 1.1). Along with the examples of the concrete marvellous deeds of human kind and the descriptions of the clashes between ethnic groups, Herodotus implicitly offers on another level the conflict of ideas between the power of freedom and the power of tyranny. What Herodotus says openly on one hand and tacitly on the other hand, in a matter-of-fact tone, is that there are two types of battles going on at the same time. Both interweave one with the other: the physical military battle and an abstract battle of ideas. He dramatizes in dialogue and in direct speeches the unspoken conflict of ideas. At the same time, in memorializing the deeds of men in events he shows that it is impossible for men not to participate in both types of battles.

One easily imagines an actual battle of men fighting men. The battle between freedom and tyranny is more difficult to comprehend. Briefly, to live in a free society, freedom means that an individual or a people have a diversity of choices; there are

different ideas or options from which one may choose to hold or to take action.⁵⁷ To live in a society under tyranny is to lose or to be without choice and diversity; the tyrant has absolute authority. Herodotus notably repeats what he has heard second-hand from an eyewitness before the battle at Plataea (479 B.C.E.). A Persian nobleman says to a Boeotian, “it is the sorest of all human sorrows to have much knowledge yet no power” (Hdt. 9.16). The Persian recognizes that although he knows that the battle will not go well, he has no diversity of choice; he must obey orders and fight (9.16).

Herodotus places this comment of the Persian in his *Histories* to show how the different political systems affect the people they govern. The Persian has no choice but to follow orders of the king with Mardonius as the general. This leads to the question: Why are there different political systems? In Chapter 1, Hansen’s nine principles of freedom fall under seven different types of political orders. Is there a reasonable theory that suggests why there are these variants in political systems?

One theory on various political systems that Forsdyke and other scholars suggest is in the Hippocratic Treatise, “Airs, Waters, and Places”.⁵⁸ The theme in the treatise describes why there are different characteristics in Greeks and in non-Greeks that lead to diverse values, actions, and political systems. The differences between Greeks and non-Greeks merge well into one of Herodotus’ purposes –to remember the deeds of all men. This treatise interweaves fittingly with the way Herodotus presents the dissimilar ethnic groups and their political orders. Further, the treatise offers a viable

⁵⁷ Ryan, Introduction, 4. Momigliano, “Persian Empire and Greek Freedom” in *The Idea of Freedom* considers the following story as authentic. The Greek Boeotian Thersander who tells Herodotus about the episode, is old enough to have been alive at the Battle of Plataea. The quote that Herodotus uses comes from one of the fifty Persian nobles who talks to his table mate at a banquet. A wealthy Theban citizen has invited fifty Persian nobles and fifty Boeotians to a feast before the Plataean battle (144).

⁵⁸ Forsdyke 2001 201 says that the most recent study of the Hippocratic Treatise is that it belongs to a set of texts, which date between 410-350 B.C.E. Jose Miguál Alonso-Nunez discusses the Hippocratic Treatise in “Herodotus’ Conception of Historical Space and the Beginning of Universal History”; J. Romm 744-747 refers to the treatise, “Herodotean Geography” in *Landmark*, Appendix D.

explanation for Herodotus' even-handed and open-minded approach to the different types of political systems.⁵⁹

The treatise discusses how climate, geography, and the development of institutions influence the general character of a people. Part twenty-three of "Airs, Waters, and Places" states that strong "heat", severe winters, frequent rains, protracted droughts, and winds affect the dispositions of people. Those who inhabit lands with such climates tend to be wild, passionate, and courageous. A changeable climate with seasons produces people who are willing to exert hard work in body and mind. Those who are free and autonomous are willing to take on dangers, not for the sake of others, but for themselves. They seek risks and go out to meet perilous situations. If they are victorious they themselves bear the rewards; if not, they are responsible for the consequences. The institutions that offer freedom contribute to their bravery; when free they (the Athenians) are individually zealous to achieve for themselves (Hdt. 4.78). Along with the Athenians the Spartans, who have the same climate and fight fiercely, develop a distinctive, complex political system.

On the other hand, those whose climates are always the same are indolent and governed by kings or at any rate one-man rule. According to the treatise, these people must be cowardly; their souls are enslaved and they will not go readily into danger to promote the power of another or themselves. Herodotus addresses these two geo-ethnographic issues (Asheri et al. 12). He says that under a tyrant the Athenians are no better than their neighbours (Hdt. 5.78). One of the many examples Herodotus uses to show that those under a king receive the lash when they face danger is in this passage: Xerxes forces his "army to cross over the Hellespont into Europe" under the lash (7.56.1).

The army of Xerxes crosses into Europe into a changed geographical area. Part twenty-four addresses the effects of a rugged geographical region on the characteristics of people. In general, according to the treatise, the dispositions of men correspond with

⁵⁹ The treatise also offers an explanation for Herodotus' approach to the different kinds of customs. In most cases he is objective when he describes the customs. However, this paper is on political freedom within political systems, not customs.

the nature of the country. In mountainous, rugged, elevated, and well-watered land with great contrasting seasonal changes, the inhabitants are enterprising and warlike, even savage and ferocious. If the soil is thin, poorly watered, and bare, the people are likely to be hard, stalwart, haughty, and self-willed. Societies in these regions are the strongest of men, hardy, sharp, industrious, vigilant, and excel in military affairs. Herodotus provides examples of these characteristics with the Spartans and the Scythians. After Darius invades Scythia, the Scythians offer an alliance to Sparta in order to punish the Persians (Hdt.6. 84.1-2). When Herodotus relates the agreement the Scythians make with the Spartans, he suggests that he considers the Scythians and the Spartans to be of the same mettle: hardy, warlike, and strong – willing to face danger and take risks as the treatise describes those who live in a rugged terrain.

Those who live in low-lying and poorly ventilated places, with warm water and the sameness in seasons lack courage and the willingness to endure hard labour; they are indolent and sluggish. Herodotus offers a dramatic example of this when the text presents the Phocaeen general, Dionysius, as he attempts to convince the Ionians at Lade to follow him and revolt against the Persians. He says that if you are disorderly and sluggish you will be punished by the king rather than victorious:

Our affairs, men of Ionia, stand on the edge of a razor, whether to be free men or slaves, and runaway slaves at that. If you now consent to endure hardships, you will have toil for the present time, but it will be in your power to overcome your enemies and gain freedom; but if you will be weak and disorderly, I see nothing that can save you from paying the penalty to the king for your rebellion (Hdt. 6.11.2-3).

The Ionians live in the coastal region of Asia Minor where the climate is temperate and the waters are warm. For a day the Ionians attempt to work hard for Dionysius, but then they choose not to obey him, saying that slavery is better (6.12). The Hippocratic Treatise offers an explanation as to why there are these differences between people who live in the low-lying areas and those who live in the rugged regions of Herodotus' known world. For most of the Ionians, slavery is preferable to hard work and risk.

The methodology this paper uses to investigate the political systems of societies such as the two types might be imagined as on an axis. The vertical line at the top is the north representing rugged Scythia; the bottom of the line is fertile Egypt in the south. The horizontal line represents the west and the east, respectively, Greece and Persia. Moving counter clock-wise, between Scythia and Greece, Greece and Egypt, Egypt and Persia, Persia and Scythia in the 360 degree “freedom” circumference, twenty other societies might have niches in the freedom circuit on the peripheries closest to one of the four states that represent the rugged or fertile land in which it is situated. Greece with its rugged seasonal changes is in the west and Persia is in the east with its vast and various physical configurations.

The analyses of these societies begin with the Medes and the Persians since Herodotus launches his *Histories* in Asia Minor. It is important to bear several matters in mind. First and foremost, freedom is the hub on which these societies and states turn. On the freedom circuit Herodotus approaches each society with an objective point of view in practically every instance. There is not one group of people that is wholly free or wholly enslaved, although one can make the argument that despite the ambiguities, Sparta remains the same throughout the *Histories*. Societies change, develop, backtrack, and move on depending on circumstances and institutions. In other words, there are shades and degrees of freedom in political systems that occur through happenstance. Societies gain freedom, maintain and lose freedom as part of a cycle in human affairs. Finally, the analyses of these political systems are based on Hansen’s seven freedom principles.

The analyses begin with the Medes and the Persians both winning their freedom through warfare (Hdt. 1.95.2, 130). The upper regions of Asia Minor are wooded with some seasonal changes. In line with the theme in the Hippocratic Treatise, the Medes are hardy, strong, and willing to risk danger, which they do when Herodotus says that they cast off the Assyrian enslavement and win freedom (1.95.2). To gain freedom a people must fight – one of the Herodotean arguments. The remarks Herodotus makes on the Medes’ system of government suggest that, although they free themselves from slavery, they control other tribes through custom and they rule tribes that are closest to them geographically (9.134). Thus, some Medes are freer than others just as the Mede

nation is free to control others. Equality (*isotês*) is not a word that Herodotus uses when he describes the Medes or their government. Herodotus offers a detailed description on how the Medes lose their freedom. One way is through internal political matters; the other way follows the pattern of victory versus defeat.

As is the custom of Herodotus, he is careful to say that he is repeating what he has heard on how the Medes lose their freedom (Hdt. 1.96.3-99.101). Deioces, a clever man, desires to rule. As the people call on him to make judgments on local disputes, he becomes so famous and powerful for his impartial decisions that one day he says that he has no time for his own business; he refuses to make judgments. Lawlessness returns; the people are desperate. Soon the citizens decide that they need a king; they choose Deioces as their king (*basileus* 1.97.3). Steadily Deioces increases his power with a bodyguard, with a strong house, and with walls within walls that circle his stronghold. His house becomes a palace with the people dwelling outside the walls. Soon he stops seeing citizens. Instead he sends out written judgments. In the end, Deioces arranges for spies and eavesdroppers to facilitate his rule (1.100).

The Deioces episode is one of the few detailed examples that Herodotus relates to show how people lose freedom without violence.⁶⁰ It takes two sides to lose freedom. In this case, the people are inactive and permit Deioces to increase his power; on his side, Deioces is active and takes the power. Despite the fact that the Medes live in a rough physical country, they would still have required vigilance to maintain freedom.

With a king who exudes power and citizens who are not dynamic and politically functional, even though the terrain is rugged, the people become soft and are easily conquered. This is what occurs when Cyrus leads the Persians to revolt against their master, Astyages, king of the Medes, in 550 B.C.E. (Hdt. 1.130). Hence, the placement of the Medes on the 360 degree freedom circuit is between the Scythians and the Persians- on a sliding scale because at one time the Medes were free, dynamic, and

⁶⁰ Pisistratus, a tyrant of Athens, illustrates another example of how a city loses freedom without violence (1.59-64). The following list is made up of the kings of the Medes; Deioces rules for 53 years (1.102) 700-647 B.C.E.; Phraortes – 22 years (1.102.2) 647-625 B.C.E.; Cyaxares – 40 years (1.106.3) 625-585 B.C.E.; Astyages - 35 years (1.130.1) 585-550 B.C.E. (H & W Vol. I., 382).

active but they permitted circumstances to aid in their fall to inaction, factions, and disorder. When they revolt from the Assyrians, there are closest to the Scythians in hardness and risk taking. When Deioces becomes king, as Herodotus relates in the horography of the Medes, the local history shows how the Medes changed in character and slithered towards Persia on the 360 degree freedom circuit of the diagram. The political system falls into Hansen's principle #7, whereby a king rules autonomously and citizens fall into place. This is the political system that Persia experiences with her kings Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes.

Persia defeats the Medes; the Persians are hardy, warlike, and free, a people who live in a mountainous region. The expansion into the rugged Mede country works well with the Hippocratic Treatise for the Persians. At this point the Persians are able to defeat a society that was once hardy, but has now grown yielding and inactive. Matters slowly begin to change as the Persians expand to the south, east, and west into fertile, temperate, and milder climates.

The Persians expand into the milder and softer western climate, where Croesus, king of Lydia is the monarch of all nations west of the Halys River (Hdt. 1.6). An independent king of many nations, Croesus acquires tributes, wealth, and slaves. Croesus also had plentiful gold; Midas was one of his ancestors (Hdt. 1.14). These riches fall to Persia after she conquers Lydia and the Ionian Greeks who lived under Lydian domination (546 B.C.E.). Aristagoras, the tyrant Persia imposes on Miletus in Ionia after the Persian conquest of Lydia, goes to Sparta in 499 B.C.E. to attempt to entice King Cleomenes to invade Asia and free the Ionians from their overlords. (One of the arguments for Sparta's aid is that the Ionians migrated from the Greek mainland, so Greeks on the mainland and Greeks on the eastern Mediterranean coast are kinsmen (Wyatt, 784, Hdt. 6.138,9.106). Once Sparta frees Ionia, the promise is that Cleomenes will acquire the great wealth of Croesus (5.49.5). To jump back to Croesus regarding wealth, the treasures in 499 B.C.E. are just as great, if not greater than when Croesus has his servants show Solon of Athens the abundance of his worldly possessions around 550 B.C.E. according to Herodotus (1.30.2).

It is during Solon's visit to Croesus that Solon states the motif that nothing stays the same (Hdt. 1.32.9). Croesus considers that he is the wealthiest and most blessed of men. Soon afterwards in 546 B.C.E., Cyrus comes with his army to defeat Croesus; Croesus loses his wealth and his kingship. Though wealthy, Lydia becomes an enslaved state rather than an autonomous kingdom. Lydia remains within the boundaries of Hansen's #7 freedom principle, but the state moves from independence to dependence. On the diagram, the state of Lydia belongs between Persia and Egypt – far south of the hardy Scythians. While Cyrus marches off to conquer Babylon, he commands Mazares, his Median slave, to enslave the Ionians thus acquiring all the riches and the fertile land of the Asian Minor coastal regions. For Herodotus there is actually a causal link between wealth and the loss of freedom, and Croesus and Lydia exemplify it.

Cyrus' next city-state to enslave is Babylon, a city of enormous wealth. Cyrus is the first to conquer the city which the Euphrates River divides - both city and river are on a fertile plain (Hdt.1.192.1). Herodotus provides a detailed description of Babylonian wealth in territory and in tributes – the wealth of Assyria is one-third of the whole wealth of Asia (1.192.2-4). The political system of Babylon changes from an autonomous rule to an enslaved state – this again illustrates Hansen's freedom principle #7 of an autonomous city-state with an external sovereign, that is, an enslaved state. The political circumstances place her on the 360-degree freedom circuit between Persia and Egypt.

With the wealth from the coastal regions and the interior of Asia on the Euphrates under the control of Cyrus, he moves north to conquer the Massagetae (Hdt. 1.204). Herodotus comments that Cyrus is eager to subdue the Massagetae who live on a wide plain of thin soil north of the Caspian Sea hemmed in by the Caucasus mountains. It almost seems that Herodotus is saying that that Cyrus is no mortal; he has not lost a single battle. With the Massagetae, his plan is to remove their autonomous Queen Tomyris' freedom and turn the Massagetae into an enslaved state (Hansen #7). Herodotus describes the Massagetae as similar to the Scythians in dress and manner of life. They fight on horseback and on foot; they live in the same type of land as the Scythians; they too are hardy, strong, warlike, and willing to take risks (1.215.1). There

is a tremendous battle between the two nations; the greater part of Cyrus' Persians fall and Cyrus dies as well (1.214).

Following the narration of the battle, Herodotus reminds his audience that there are several different stories about the death of Cyrus, but the one Herodotus relates is one of the several he hears. To show his audience his objectivity he distances himself from the story by ensuring that the audience knows that this is not the only tale, and it may not even be the true one. In any case, the man who leads the Persians to victory and freedom as an autonomous kingdom under himself as king dies (Hdt.1.214.5). A moral could be gleaned from this. De Selincourt points out that the Persians are originally hardy mountain people, warlike and frugal, but they are quick to assimilate the customs of others and their expansion brings wealth and luxury.⁶¹ On the other hand, this is a battle; men die in battles. And cultural changes do not take hold just within the career of one man. If one takes Cyrus the man as the representative of Persia, a foreshadowing of what is to unfold for Persia, and a part of Herodotus' message on freedom versus the wealth and luxury which lure the Persians, there is the strong suggestion that riches and freedom do not mix well. Perhaps wealth washes out the desire to be active in the mind; it may drain away the extra energy that is required in battles. The Hippocratic Treatise argues that barren rugged land and poverty, along with action, determine military strength. This is not to say definitely that the Persian army has become soft and inactive, rather that even within the lifetime of Cyrus the kernel is planted of greed and of not being content – this is another one of Herodotus' motifs in his *Histories*. Greed and such discontent are incompatible with freedom.

The motif of greed accompanies Cyrus' son Cambyses into Egypt (Hdt. 2. 1.2). Libya, Cyrene, and Barca are part of the province of Egypt. Directly following Cyrus' death, Cambyses leads his army into Egypt (Hdt. 3.91-2). On the freedom circuit Egypt is due south of the Scythians in the north and is the complete opposite (Herodotus says all the customs are the complete opposite as well. To say all the customs in the north

⁶¹ De Selincourt 1982 215. It is possible to raise the argument that wealth and luxury cause defeat. Romm 2007 746 suggests that Herodotus may not have subscribed to a strict notion of geography and climate as the only influence on human behaviour in the way that "Airs, Waters, and Places" does, but Herodotus does illustrate in his episodes and examples that the physical characteristics of a territory have some bearing on the actions of a people.

are the opposite of the south does this not imply a northern bias in Herodotus' viewpoint). Egypt is on the delta of the Nile, the climate in all seasons is the same (2.77). There are fish, fruit, honey, raisins, figs, frankincense, myrrh, and other kinds of incense, geese, wheat, and barley (2.36.2, 37.4, 40.3, 95). The land is cultivated; it is a land of abundance (2.77.1). Cambyses defeats this prosperous Egyptian land. The people of Libya, Cyrene, and Barca all surrender in fright and bring tribute to Cambyses (3.13). Persia now has the riches of Egypt to add to the Mediterranean coastal region, plus Babylon, but none of that benefits Cambyses particularly. His reign is fraught with intrigue and he dies prematurely (3.64).

The love of luxury and riches nevertheless take hold. Darius, the next king of Persia, leads his army directly north to the Scythian country of wooded, rugged, and mountainous terrain as well as the plains that stretch from what is now Ukraine. Tribute, slaves, expanded territory and power are the incentives for the invasion.⁶² One might add that Darius leads his men into the same type of terrain where Cyrus meets his fate in battle with the Massagetae, to the north and east. So called "royal", nomadic Scythians consider the non-nomadic Scythian farmers as slaves, but the neighbouring Scythian kings as political equals (Hdt. 4.20.1, 102)⁶³. The neighbouring kings have already met in council on account of the approaching danger. In consultation, the Scythians devise a clever plan to ward off any loss of freedom. Herodotus is quick to say that he does not praise the Scythians in all respects, but in this matter he has no qualifications. Two issues arise from this.

One issue is that Herodotus does not hesitate to show his admiration when it is warranted. In this case admiration is complete because the Scythians cleverly plan a strategy that ensures that they will not lose their freedom (Hdt. 4.46.2). In this dry, stony land, for eight months of the year it is exceedingly cold with continuous snow and unbearable frost; the remaining four months are rainy and cold: (4.123, 128.1, 131). In this type of country with no established cities, the Scythians are able to avoid their enemies and lose them. In Darius' case there is no exception. Darius never finds the

⁶² De Selincourt 1982 238.

⁶³ Cf. Wheeler 2007 760.

Scythians willing to battle in a conventional manner. As a result, because the Ionian tyrant guards at the bridge over the Ister do not destroy it as the Scythians suggest, Darius is able to cross back over north of Thrace. The reader is left with the knowledge that there is a complete contrast between the two lands of Egypt and Scythia as might be shown in the vertical points of north and south. In both instances, freedom is the factor. The warm fertile land of Egypt loses its freedom and becomes an enslaved province of Persia. In the cold barren and stony land of the Scythians, autonomous freedom is never lost; no external sovereign power rules them; action and cleverly planned unity ensures their liberty.

In spite of the rugged land that the Perinthians inhabit on the European side of the Sea of Marmara, the odds are too great for them against Megabazus and his Persian army on their way to Thrace. The Perinthians, as Herodotus says in admiration, fight like brave men for their freedom: “Now they fought like brave men for their liberty, but Megabazus and the Persians overcame them by weight of numbers” (Hdt. 5.2.1). Herodotus uses the word “brave” (ἀγαθῶν) selectively. His motto is that even though the Perinthians lose in their battle with the Persians, they deserve the description of brave, manly, and good men. With the defeat in battle, although the audience knows the Perinthians lose the battle fighting bravely, as one of his purposes in writing the text, memory of men’s deeds in fighting for freedom is memorialized. The Perinthians fight for freedom in the wild cold northland; the people of Lybia, of Cyrene, and of Barca surrender without a fight in the warm, temperate land of the south (3.13). These examples from the north and from the south appear to validate the Hippocratic treatise that men who live in rough lands are hardy and warlike; men who live in warm lands are soft and lazy. Thus, on the political scale for brave and warlike characteristics the Perinthians are near the Scythians, but the enslaved political system puts the placement of the Perinthians in the diagram closer to Persia (Hansen #7). Herodotus does not comment on their ethnicity, but they are said to sing a “paean”, so they were likely Greek-speaking.

Thrace too has its fair share of brave men who fight yet lose their freedom. The Gatae in Thrace fight, as Herodotus says, with obstinacy, yet Darius enslaves them (Hdt. 4.93). With the Persian invasion and defeat on the Greek mainland in the years

following the Marathon battle of 490 B.C.E., Xerxes, now king of Persia, is in Thrace and forces the Thracian tribes to join his land army (7.110). All the Thracian tribes but the Satrae become part of Xerxes' army. To interject, Herodotus says that if the Thracian tribes would unite, they would be invincible (5.3). The Satrae have always been free men and are still to this day as Herodotus writes:

The Satrae, as far as we know, have never yet been subject to any man; they alone of the Thracians have continued living in freedom to this day; they dwell on high mountains covered with forests of all kinds and snow, and they are excellent warriors (Hdt. 7.111.1).

It appears that Herodotus and the Hippocratic Treatise written, scholars assume, after Herodotus dies, hold similar views: rugged lands for the most part produce fierce warlike men who maintain the value of freedom uppermost in their minds. The political spot for the Thracian Satrae tribe is on the 360-degree freedom circuit between Scythia and Athens in Greece on the western side of the diagram right next to Sparta.

The best description of the Spartan characteristics come from Demaratus the exiled Spartan king, when he describes the Lacedaemonians to Xerxes before the 480/79 B.C.E. invasion of Greece (Hdt. 7.102). Xerxes commands Demaratus to tell him about the Spartans. It is customary for a king to order a person of lower rank to speak, even Demaratus who has found refuge in Persia, cannot speak without permission from the king. By now the Persian kingship has turned practically into a tyranny like the one Otanes describes in the Constitutional Debate (3.80.3-5). Demaratus responds to Xerxes:

In Hellas poverty is always endemic, but courage is acquired as the fruit of wisdom and strong law; by use of this courage Hellas defends herself from poverty and tyranny. Now I praise all the Greeks who dwell in those Dorian lands, yet I am not going to speak these words about all of them, but only about the Lacedaemonians. First, they will never accept conditions from you that bring slavery upon Hellas; and second, they will meet you in battle even if all the other Greeks are on your side. (7.102.1-1)

This foreshadows Leonidas and the Spartans at Thermopylae (7.220-225). The Spartans will never stop fighting for freedom; that is, they will fight to maintain the

freedom that they have. They use wisdom, rather than material wealth from their land or favours from a benevolent foreign king, to combat poverty.

The freedom the Spartans have comes under Hansen's #7 freedom principle; it is an autonomous freedom, but differs from the other autonomous political systems. Cartledge calls it a political arrangement significantly different from the Greek norm; Sealey calls it an ambiguous system.⁶⁴ There are other autonomous political systems, such as the Persian, Scythian, Massagetas, and that of the Thracian Satrae, but none of them has set laws like the Spartans'. According to Herodotus, the Spartans attribute their laws to Lycurgus. Many years in the past, it is said, Lycurgus established all affairs that relate to war, the sworn companies, the Thirty, the Ephors, the Council of Elders, and the common meals (Hdt. 1.65.5).⁶⁵ What is important for this paper is that Sparta has no external sovereign power, which is what Socles, the Corinthian, argues about when Sparta calls on its allies to help re-install Hippias as the tyrant in Athens (Hdt. 5.92A).

Sparta calls Corinth, Greece and the other allies of the Peloponnesian League to an assembly on account of her fear of Athens' growing power.⁶⁶ Socles criticizes Sparta for even considering to remove Athens' autonomy and to re-instate a tyrant. Socles' method of chastisement is to tell the story of the tyrants that the Corinthians endured from Cypselus to Periander (Hdt. 5.92B-G).⁶⁷ The ability for Socles to speak as freely (ἐλευθέρως) as he does without Sparta's asking him to speak indicates that there is some freedom of speech between Sparta and her allies, yet there is not full freedom. As Forsdyke says, to speak "freely" shows that there is Spartan external power over her

⁶⁴ Cartledge 2007 728; Sealey 1976 70. After investigating a number of different arrangements on the Spartan political system, I call it a military oligarchy or a political order of checks and balances.

⁶⁵ The scholarly debate continues on whether or not Lycurgus was a mortal man, a combination of man and legend, or a myth.

⁶⁶ Cartledge 2007 594 says that only the Spartans could call an assembly; the allies are permitted to disagree; however, only an oracle can overturn a decision. I suggest that this is one of Herodotus' warnings that concern a state when it expands too far and becomes too rich. As Solon tells Croesus, nothing stays the same (1.32.9). At the time of Herodotus' writing his *Histories*, Athens is becoming wealthy from the tributes of the city states that are part of the Delian League formed in 497 B.C.E.

⁶⁷ The last tyrant that Corinth had was in 587 B.C.E.

allies and as Cartledge says, allies cannot call for an assembly.⁶⁸ The problem of where to place Corinth on the 360 degree freedom circuit is difficult. She is without a tyrant so has autonomous internal freedom; she is able to speak up in an assembly, yet it appears that there is an ambiguous delicate line that she must not cross. She is a Greek. Is she politically naturally free? She values her freedom, but in some periods she is not politically free. Most likely, the closest analysis would demonstrate that she falls into the motif that Solon introduces, “nothing stays the same”. When Sparta falls, Corinth’s power may rise. To answer the question concerning the present time in Herodotus’ text, it is safe to say – and there is an argument to be made on any point – that there is ambiguity just as Sparta’s internal political affairs are ambiguous. Externally, Sparta is autonomous and belongs next to Athens on the 360-degree freedom circuit; it is the opposite for Corinth. The most likely spot for Corinth is nearest Sparta between Scythia and Sparta. Corinth straddles the line in the freedom principle #7 between an enslaved yet autonomous state. There is one city-state, Athens, where there is no ambiguity in either the external or internal political system.

At the time of Herodotus’ writing of the *Histories*, Athens is the city-state that is autonomous externally and internally. She fits neatly into Hansen’s freedom principle #5. Her citizens rule and are ruled in turn, she has free speech (*isegoria*), equality (*isonomia*) and once she has political freedom from the Pisistratid tyrants, she has civic strength which enables her to overcome her neighbours. Each individual fights for himself as he fights for his *polis*; each individual fights for freedom (Hdt. 5.78).⁶⁹ Why does it all seem to come together with Athens? Otanes raises the issue of popular government; Histiaeus first uses the word democracy (*demokratia*); Herodotus says that the freedom to be equal is good (Hdt. 3.80.2; 4.137.2; 5.78).

Athens is situated on barren land with thin soil; she is in a rugged land of mountains and valleys. For the most part, her citizens are not wealthy even when the Laurion silver mines are discovered and ships are built, although that increases the wealth of the city and the citizens along with it (Hdt. 7.144.1). Other groups have similar

⁶⁸ Forsdyke 2001 344; Cartledge 2007 594

⁶⁹ Cf. Forsdyke 2001 343.

conditions, but are not democratic. According to the Hippocratic Treatise, those who live in the physical conditions that the Spartans and the Athenians live in are free and undertake dangers on their own account (Hipp., *Aer.* 23-24). These people are imaginative and exert themselves in body and mind. They build institutions that contribute to their individuality. They are clever, industrious, opinionated, and excel in military affairs. Sparta comes closest to Athens in these respects, particularly with the physical terrain, the body, and military matters. However, the law (*Rhetra*), which each Spartan male must follow, appears to stifle the mind as far as ingenuity goes and new developments in institutions are concerned. The individual appears not to be the base that becomes a part of a group that decides on a course of action, rather the individual disappears into a military unit that follows orders. As Demaratus says to Xerxes, the Spartans are invincible in battle (7.102.3). Both the Spartans and the Athenians say that they will fight and do fight for freedom until the end. When Alexander the envoy from Mardonius arrives to propose an agreement between the Persians and the Athenians, the Athenians say that they will fight and they do fight for freedom until the end without ceasing (8.143.3). Each Athenian will fight for himself in a unit because he has decided on his own volition; he decides for himself; he is not under orders until he decides to follow the elected general.

Athens is made up of those who think for themselves and are accountable for their deeds (shades of Herodotus in Hdt. 1.1). Athens belongs on the 360-degree freedom circuit directly across from Persia. Cyrus leads Persia to freedom, but more importantly, for the democratic freedom issue, Cyrus as a young boy and individual tells Astyages that he is responsible for his own actions and will take the punishment that he deserves (1.115.3). It is little to be wondered that on one level the east and the west engage in a mighty clash. Along with expansion, wealth, luxury, and the desire for more of the same, the power of the idea of freedom brings the two forces together. The power of freedom never ceases; Cyrus is a free person as a child and as king of Persia, where everyone except the king is unfree; Athens is a free city made up of free individuals.

How does freedom fit into other city-states? In Ionia the population is Greek. Three selected examples from Ionia will show how freedom and tyranny intersect or do not intersect.

Miletus has the experience of both tyranny and freedom (Hdt.6.5). Once Aristagoras the tyrant is gone, the Milesians ensure that they will not knuckle under to another tyrant. Histiaeus, the general who first mentions democracy on the Ister Bridge, and later is involved with the Ionian revolt against the king, attempts a return to Miletus (4.137, 6.3). However, as Herodotus relates, the people of Miletus have tasted freedom and demonstrate their dislike of tyranny when Histiaeus stealthy returns at night. They wound him, and force him to retreat to Chios. The interesting concept with this episode is that the Spartan young men, Sperthias and Bulis, who are on their way to Xerxes' court in Susa, tell the Persian Hydarnes that once he tastes freedom nothing will stop him from fighting for his freedom (7.135.3). The people of Miletus know what it is like to live under tyranny and they have tasted freedom. They choose violence to ensure that they maintain their freedom. Hydarnes is indifferent to the Spartan youths' words; this illustrates his ignorance of what it is like to be free; absolute power is more comfortable, but shaky because of suspicions, jealousy, factions and inter fighting. For the city-state of Miletus, Hansen's #7 freedom principle for the present time has internal freedom and external freedom, but the freedom does not last, until finally in the last book of the *Histories*, we read that the Ionians revolt a second time from their masters (9.104). The city of Miletus does its part. The Persians do not trust Miletus. The Milesians have a history of being untrustworthy slaves. For eleven years the Milesians fight for freedom against Alyattes, father of Croesus, (1.18-22). After Cyrus conquers Croesus of Lydia, instead of fighting the city signs a treaty with Cyrus (1.169.2). Even so, the Milesians continue to fight Persia; they either perish or are enslaved (6.6-7, 18-21). In this second revolt from the Persians, because of a lack of trust, the Persians send the Milesians to guard the passes at Mycale. Instead of guarding the Persians in the pass, the Milesians kill them. With that episode, this is the last we know of the Milesians in Herodotus' text (9.104). The lessons to learn are that in accordance with freedom, violence is the method that protects freedom. Secondly, once a city is free, an active and vigilant society must never allow itself to be lulled into complacency. Thus, the point on the 360-degree freedom circuit for the Milesians is next to Athens - between Athens and Egypt. It is closer to the Egyptian geography, having a fertile landscape, but the Milesian action mostly overcomes the suggested characteristics offered in the Hippocratic Treatise. Furthermore, the Milesians have their past history of the rugged Greek mainland as part of their nature.

The Cyprians and Ionians have the opportunity to fight for their freedom like the Milesians in book 9, but to fight the Persians, a united strategy is a necessity (Hdt. 5.109, 116). The Cyprians suggest a plan but the Ionians refuse (5.209.2-3). The end result is that because of a lack of unity, the Cyprians lose their one year of freedom and the Ionians remain slaves under tyranny and Persian domination (5.116). Internal freedom remains and in some cities of Ionia there is democracy, which Mardonius sets up after the tyrants prove unreliable, but they are still dependent cities (6.43.3). These city-states illustrate Hansen's freedom principle #7. In this episode, Cyprus and the Ionians on the political stage belong on the 360-degree freedom circuit half way between Athens and Egypt. The Cyprians know freedom and fight to maintain it. The Ionians, in book 5, do what they can to prevent a change in their comfortable lives structured under tyranny.

As for the Ionians at Lade, the Phocaeen general Dionysius offers the Ionians the chance to be free of the Persians (Hdt. 7.11-12). The offer includes hard work; the Ionians choose slavery. Hansen's #7 freedom principle that encompasses the enslaved state fits the Ionians at Lade. The political space of such an enslaved state is next to Egypt on the 360-degree freedom circuit.

The question arises, why are there these variations in response to the perils of slavery? The Ionian Coast is mild; it has a warm, temperate climate, and is fertile, similar to Egypt. Why do not all the Ionians choose slavery? Something called collective consciousness comes down through generations. In the cases where freedom is experienced and fought for, in theory, the memories of a free ancient past on the Greek mainland may endure, just as Cyrus' Median ancestors fought and gained freedom from the Assyrians. (One could argue that that free spirit remains a part of Cyrus' nature.) The next question is why do all the Ionians not fight for freedom? Circumstances change, the comfortable life style and the luxury of the Ionian coast influence those who prefer slavery. The work is too hard; the work is too tiring; the work is too uncomfortable, so they do not obey the Phocaeen Dionysius, and thus slavery is their lot (Hdt. 6.12.3).

However, Herodotus does not end his *Histories* on a low note or even on the note that the only way to freedom is through violence and fighting. Just as the Athenians take action when they put their women and children on ships for Salamis, leaving the city for the Persians, and just as Cyrus in Hdt. 9.122 reminds the Persians how to be free by going back to their rugged land and living frugally, the Phocaeans and Teians of Ionia take action to win freedom (1.164-166). The Phocaeans detest slavery; they ask Harpagus for a day's grace to take counsel, and then they sail to Chios with their people, goods, and statues from the temples and on to Cyrene. Some of the citizens cannot bear to leave their familiar surroundings and break the iron oath not to return until the iron that the Phocaeans sank into the sea rises to the surface, and they sail back to Phocaea (1.165). Those who sail away consider themselves free, as do the Teians of Ionia.

The Teians like the Phocaeans sail away to Thrace to found the city of Abdera (Hdt. 1.168). The Phocaeans and the Teians are the only Ionians who will not endure slavery, except for the Milesians –the Milesians experience both slavery and freedom:

The rest of the Ionians, except the Milesians, though they faced Harpagus in battle as did the exiles, and conducted themselves well, each fighting for his own country, yet, when they were defeated and their cities taken, they remained where they were and did as they were told. (1.169.1)

Action that requires hard work, discomfort, and fear is the other method that can gain or retain freedom. As the individual is the fundamental basis of freedom, so is action. It takes action to fight for freedom; it takes action to remove oneself. On the political measurement of the 360-degree freedom circuit, Phocaea and Teios are closest to Athens. Athens is the only city-state that uses both methods to fight tyranny. Her strategy is originality in thought, decisiveness, and unity in following a course once the citizens make a decision. In this way through a combination of expertise in putting value on the individual, and an awareness of historical and current circumstances, Athens and Greece maintain their freedom from tyranny. For now, as Herodotus indicates implicitly, Athens and much of Greece, the Phocaeans and the Teians experience autonomous freedom (Hansen's #7). For Athens the reader is cognizant that this city-state combines Hansen's principles #5 and #7.

Herodotus approaches Athens' democratic political system with a positive view; one of the signs is his rare comment in the use of the word, "good". He says equality is a good thing (χρῆμα σπουδαῖον, Hdt. 5.78), yet the Constitutional Debate (3.80-82) pointedly stakes out the defects in democracy. His *Histories* record numerous examples of questionable acts in democracy. Thus, Herodotus demonstrates the negative and the positive aspects of democracy in the use of freedom. Athens makes several doubtful decisions once she is free: she is taken in by Pisistratus' clever ruse and guile to acquire autocratic rule (1.59, 64); she sends twenty ships to Ionia to aid in defeating Persian domination, which causes more rancour between Athens and Persia (5.97.2-3). Herodotus does not mince words when he says that it was easier for Aristagoras to deceive thirty thousand Athenians than the one man, Cleomenes.⁷⁰ On the other hand, for the most part Herodotus is even-handed and open minded concerning the political systems he describes in his *Histories* – except for tyranny.

Democratic freedom does not have a place in a political system of tyranny. Democratic freedom versus tyranny is the focus of the clash between Greece and Persia: first with Darius and then with Xerxes, their actions fulfill the role of a tyrant.⁷¹ Under Darius and Xerxes in contrast to Athenian democratic freedom, Persia does not have individualism, popular government, accountability, free speech, the system in which the people rule and are ruled in turn or equality. Athens has choices and options, unity, and hard work. Cyrus gives the Persians choices (Hdt. 1.126-127). The choice is one that suggests a shade of guile, yet there is a choice, but not the numerous continuous choices that Athenians have. There is a unity under Cyrus to break free of the Medes, but under Darius and Xerxes the lash is prevalent for expansion and conquest (3.130.2; 7.35.1, 54.3,7, 103.4-5, 7. 223.3). The lash forces a slave (so tyrants believed) to tell the truth or an army to move forward. Both political systems (democratic freedom and tyranny) require hard work, but there is a difference, the work is taken up, on one hand, willingly; on the other hand, the tyrant forces the men to work hard.

⁷⁰ Cleomenes had the help of his very young and astute daughter, Gorgo.

⁷¹ Dewald 2007 835-842 forms a list of tyrants in the *Histories*: Peiander (Corinth), Polycrates (Samos), Pisistratus, Hippias, Hipparchus (Athens), Thrasyboulas, Histiaeus, Aristagoras (Miletus), Cleisthenes (Sicyon), Gelon (Syracuse), Miltiades the elder (Chersonese). Waters 1971 48 calls the Ionian tyrants Persian puppets.

According to How and Wells, tyranny is the negation of law and order; it is the rule of an autocrat, full of pride and suspicion with a shaky rule; it kills men and ruins the honour of women to “gratify the desire of the moment” (Hdt. 3.80).⁷² According to Socles, the tyrant appears innocuous at first, but later grows to be harsh and inaccessible (4.92). Deioces the Mede is an example of openness to the people, but later becomes cruel and tyrannical (1.96-103).

Tyranny is one of the topics that Herodotus writes on without even-handedness. In fact, he uses the first personal pronoun when he says that it is incredible “to me” that the Alcmeonidae, who despise tyranny more than Callias, would form a plan with Persia. Callias is known to be the “tyrant hater” (Hdt. 6.121.1).⁷³ Herodotus is even-handed when he describes other monarchical systems, in particular, the kingship of Cyrus and Amasis. The fact that Cyrus leads the Persians to freedom and to conquer other kingdoms without the use of the lash suggests that his kingdom is stable. Further, he is wise enough to take the advice of Croesus. (Croesus finally learns his lessons from Solon while on the pyre.) These are all positives for Cyrus’ kingship (1.155, 156; 3.82). Amasis in Egypt cleverly arranges for the Egyptians to ask him to be king; in fact, Herodotus says the people consent to be his slaves. At the same time Amasis builds marvellous structures and brings stability and prosperity to the kingdom (2.172-182). Herodotus does not condemn the monarchy.

Issues arise from the subjects of the monarchy and democracy. If guile or what one may call “cleverness” leads to stability and security, does that suggest that Herodotus understands that a good end, such as stability and/ or freedom, indicates that the means are justifiable? In Athens the issue is freedom; Themistocles is deceitful and clever; because of his cleverness, the Greeks win the Salamis naval battle (Hdt. 8.80).

In conclusion – a primary question forces an issue. Are the Greeks by nature, naturally free? If one answers that question based on the Hippocratic Treatise – then, yes. Nearly all, not just the Greeks, but those who live in rugged, hard, and

⁷² H. & W. Vol II, Apendix xvi, 338-347; cf. Salmon 2003 317

⁷³ Godley 1921 says that the Callias chapter may be an interpolation found in only one class of the MSS.

uncomfortable climates are free naturally or become free; the original Persians, the Massagetae, the Scythians, some of the Thracian tribes, Sparta, Athens, and those in Ionia who remember their past. Another issue to consider is: Why is Herodotus' approach to the various political systems seemingly impartial and objective? For Herodotus, if there is order, balance, and harmony between classes, stability and security, then those are the conditions important to humankind.⁷⁴ Ethnicity may have a bearing on whether a society is free or not free, if only because the ethnic group lives in certain geographical regions. Persia is an exception with the expansion in territory and the acquisition of wealth and power; there is the sense that tyrants lack self-control. A lack of self-control is anathema to Herodotus. In this case Hansen's #8 freedom principle comes into play. The #8 principle is the freedom to control one's greed, emotions, and desires. Xerxes is a prime example of one who does not have that freedom. The lashing of the Hellespont and the fact that he goes against the advice of Artabanus and Demaratus in regard to the conquest of Greece are examples of a lack of control (Hdt. 7.35). Darius as well comes under the Hansen #8 freedom principle along with Xerxes. Both try to conquer Greece to acquire more land, wealth, and power; both tyrants fail. Freedom, the leading motif, triumphs over tyranny.

In Hdt. 9.122 Cyrus, the individual, advises the Persians to return to their barren mountainsides rather than become slaves trapped in the desire to conquer more land, more people, and gather more wealth. The Persians who accept Cyrus' directives return to their land; if they choose not to do so, Herodotus implies, with Cyrus, eventually there will be an implosion; all will collapse and there will be no more freedom. Is that a warning to Athens? For Herodotus in his *Histories*, freedom reigns supreme.

⁷⁴ Ostwald 1982 40.

Bibliography

- Adams, F. and D.C. Stevenson. 1994-2000. *Hippocrates (460?-377) On Airs, Waters, Places*. The Internet Classics Archive.
- Alonso-Nunez, J. M. 2003. "Herodotus' Conception of Historical Space and the Beginnings of Universal History," in *Herodotus and His World Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*. Eds. P. Derow and Robert Parker. Oxford, 145-152.
- Asheri, D., Alan Lloyd, and Aldo Corcella. 2007. "General Introduction" in *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV*. Eds. O. Murray, and A. Moreno. Oxford, 1-56.
- Cartledge, P. 2007. "The Spartan State in War and Peace, Appendix B," in *The Landmark Herodotus*. Ed. R. B. Strassler. New York and Toronto, 728-736.
- Cawkwell, G. L. 2007. "The Ionian Revolt, Appendix H," in *The Landmark Herodotus*. Ed. R. B. Strassler. New York and Toronto, 762-768.
- De Selincourt, A. 1954. *Herodotus The Histories*. London, New York. 1982. *The World of Herodotus*. San Francisco.
- Dewald, C. 2007. "Tyranny in Herodotus, Appendix T," in *The Landmark Herodotus*. Ed. R. B. Strassler. New York and Toronto, 835-837.
- Forrest, W. G. 1968. *A History of Sparta 950-192*. New York.
- Forsdyke, S. 2001. "Athenian Democratic Ideology and Herodotus' *Histories*." *American Journal of Philology* 122: 325-358.
- Gilula, D. 2003. "Who Was Actually Buried in the First of the Three Spartan Graves (Hdt. 9. 85. 1)? Textual and Historical Problems," in *Herodotus and His World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*. Eds. P. Derow and Robert Parker. Oxford, 73-88.
- Godley, A.D. 1920-1925. *Herodotus*. 4 vols. London.
- Hansen, M.H. 2010. "Democratic Freedom and the Concept of Freedom in Plato and Aristotle." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 50: 1-27.

- Crook, J.A., trans. 1999. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, Oxford.
- Holland, T. 2013. *Herodotus The Histories*. London, New York, Toronto, Dublin, Melbourne, New Delhi, Gauten.
- Hornblower, S. and A. Spawforth, eds. 2003. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford.
- How, W.W. and J. Wells. 1913. *A Commentary on Herodotus*. Books 1-4. Oxford.
- . 1927. *A Commentary on Herodotus* Books 5-9. Oxford.
- Hude, C. 1927. *Herodoti Historia*. Oxford.
- Lateiner, D. 2013. "Herodotean historiographical patterns: 'The Constitutional Debate'," In *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies Herodotus: Volume I*. Ed. R. V. Munson. Oxford, 194-211.
- Mirhady, D.C. 2000. "The Athenian Rationale for Torture," in *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens*. Eds. V. Hunter, and J. Edmondson. Oxford, 57-64.
- Mirhady, D.C. and Y.L. Too. 2000. *Isocrates*. Austin, Texas.
- Momigliano, A. 1979. "Persian Empire and Greek Freedom," in *The Idea of Freedom. Essays In Honour of Isaiah Berlin*. Ed. A. Ryan. Oxford, 139-151.
- Ostwald, M. 1982. *Autonomia: Its Genesis and Early History*. Chico, CA.
- Powell, J.E. 1938. *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, 2nd ed. Hildesheim, Zurich.
- Rhodes, P. 1984. *The Athenian Constitution*. London.
- Romm, J. 2007. "Herodotean Geography, Appendix D" in *The Landmark Herodotus*, New York and Toronto, 744-747.
- Ryan, A. 1979. "Introduction" in *The Idea Freedom Essays in Honour of Isaiah Berlin*. Ed. A. Ryan. Oxford, 1-14.
- Salmon, J. 2003. "Cleisthenes of Athens and Corinth" in *Herodotus and His World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*. Eds. P. Derow and Robert Parker. Oxford, 219-236.
- Saunders, T.J. 2002. *Aristotle Politics*, Books I and II. Oxford.
- Sealey, R. 1976. *A History of Greek City States 700-338 B.C.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.

- Sinclair, T.A. and T.J. Saunders. 1981. *Aristotle The Politics*. London.
- Thompson, S. 1951. *The Folktale*. New York.
- Waterford, R. 1997. "Suppliant Women" in *Euripides Orestes and Other Plays*. Oxford and New York, 138-171.
- Waters, K. 1971. *Herodotus On Tyrants And Despots. A Study in Objectivity*. Stuttgart.
- Wheeler, L. W. 2007. "The Continuity of Steppe Culture, Appendix G" in *The Landmark Herodotus*. New York and Toronto, 759-761.
- Wiedemann, T. 1989. *Greek and Roman Slavery*. London.
- Wyatt, W. F. 2007. "Dialect and Ethnic Groups in Herodotus, Appendix K" in *The Landmark Herodotus*. New York and Toronto, 781-785.

Appendix I.

Primary & Secondary Passages on Freedom

Section One, the Primary citations, lists the passages that incorporate the word “freedom”. Section two has the Secondary citations and lists the passages that touch on the idea of freedom. These passages are based on Hansen’s nine Freedom Principles discussed in Chapter 1 and may have a related word, such as “slavery”.

PRIMARY CITATIONS:

#1 Freedom Principle – An individual is either a slave or a free person.

1.116
2.134-135

#2 Freedom Principle – A person is a legal citizen, a free- born citizen.

No entries.

#3 Freedom Principle – Democracy versus Tyranny. A Democracy means that the citizens internally rule and they are ruled in turn. A tyranny means that people are enslaved and subject to a tyrant.

1.95-96, 168-170
3.80-82
4.136-137, 139, 142
5.46, 49, 62-64, 66, 77-78, 91-92, 109, 116

#4 Freedom Principle - Poverty versus Wealth - The free people are poor; they are the multitude and the citizens.

1.168-172
3.80-82
4.137
5.109
6.11
7.102-103
8.142

#5 Freedom Principle – To Rule and to be Ruled in Turn – The citizens participate in the government, but only in democracies.

3.83
4.137
5.78
6.109

#6 Freedom Principle – Free Lifestyle – One has the right to speak one’s mind without permission.

8.83
4.137
5.78
7.134-135
9.98

#7 Freedom Principle – Independent Polis versus a Dependent Polis - An independent city-state or a people has autonomy; it is self-governing and not dominated by an external power. A dependent city-state is an enslaved state dominated by an external power.

1.26.1, 95-100
2.172.5, 173.1, 147
3.83-82
4.110, 128, 139
5.2, 37, 55, 91
6.43
8.77

#8 Freedom Principle – Self-Control - One is free from a lack of self-control. The opposite is to be trapped by desires.

3.81
7.18, 104, 139
8.77

#9 Freedom Principle – Free Time – Schola, which means that one has happiness and the leisure to do what wants to do.

No entries.

SECONDARY PRINCIPLES:

#1 Freedom Principle – An individual is either a slave or a free person.

No entries.

#2 Freedom Principle – A person is a legal citizen, a free-born citizen.

6.109

#3 Freedom Principle – Democracy versus Tyranny - Democracy means to be internally free to rule and to be ruled. A tyranny means that people are enslaved and subject to a tyrant.

1.96-97, 103
2.172-3
3.80.6, 83.2, 139-142
5.37 46
7.3, 49, 138
8.140, 144
9.44

#4 Freedom Principle – Poverty versus Wealth – The people are poor; they are the multitude and the citizens.

1.168-170
6.142

#5 Freedom Principle – To Rule and to be Ruled in Turn – The citizens participate in the government, but only in democracies.

No entries.

#6 Freedom Principle – Free Life Style – One has the right to speak one's mind without permission.

5.91.2-92
7.2-3, 46, 51-53, 102-104
8.142-143
9.41

#7 Freedom Principle – Independent Polis versus a Dependent polis An independent city-state or a people has autonomy; it is self-governing and not dominated by an external power. A dependent city-state is an enslaved state dominated by an external power.

1.94, 96-99, 101, 168-170
5.49, 64-66, 77-78, 91 92
6.11
7.104.4, 135
8.142
9.41, 45, 60

#8 Freedom Principle – Self-Control – One is free from a lack of self-control. The opposite is to be trapped by desires.

8.80
5.49, 51, 91-92
7.57, 139

#9 Freedom Principle – Free Time – Schola, which means that one has happiness and the leisure to do what one wants to do.

5.78

Appendix II.

Political Systems based on Societies & City-states from Chap. 3

Autonomous Political Systems with one change or no change in the Autonomous Condition:

Sparta – 7.102, 104, 105
Scythians – 4.110
Massagetae – 1.214
Thracian Satrae – 7.100

Societies with One or More Changes in their Political Systems:

Enslaved – Autonomous – Enslaved

Medes – 1.95-100
Cyprus – 5.116

Enslaved – King

Persia – 1.126-130

Kings – Enslaved

Egypt – 2.147, 172-173
Lydia – 1.26.1
Babylon – 1.191-142

Tyrant – Free (ambiguous)

Corinth – 5.92
Samos – 3.139-140

Tyrant – Autonomous – internal and external

Athens – 5.78

Enslaved

Lybia – 3.91
Lade – 6.11-12

Autonomous – Enslaved

Perinthus – 5.2
Thracian Gatae – 4.93

Enslaved – Autonomous – Enslaved – Free

Miletus – 9.104

City-State - Split – some enslaved; some left to colonize elsewhere

Tierans 1.168-169

Phocaeans 1.164, 169